

The Historical Outlook

A JOURNAL FOR

READERS, STUDENTS AND TEACHERS OF HISTORY

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine

EDITED IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR HISTORICAL SERVICE AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION. ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, MANAGING EDITOR

Volume X.
Number 5.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1919.

\$2.00 a year.
25 cents a copy.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Japan and the Great War, by Prof. P. J. Treat - - -	233
Synchronization of Chinese and Occidental History, by Prof. K. S. Latourette - - - - -	238
Revolution in Hungary, by Prof. L. M. Larson - - -	239
The Food Administration: A Test of American Democracy, by Dr. E. S. Brown - - - - -	242
Background of Germany's Hold on Russia, by Eugene N. Curtis	246
English History and an Anglo-American Entente, by Prof. A. L. Cross - - - - -	254
Class Methods in History Teaching - - -	256-262
History Recitation Socialized, by R. A. Mackie; Closed versus Open Book Test, by M. J. Burr; Confederation and the Constitution, by Mae C. Bidwell	
History in the Summer Schools, 1919 - - -	262
Supplement — Reports on History Teaching - - -	273-298
Preliminary Report of Committee on History and Education for Citizenship; A One-Year Course in European History, by Jane E. Harnett; Report by Peninsula Section of the California Commission on European History; Resolutions of the Bay Section of the Same Commission; Final Report of the Commission.	

Notes on Periodical Literature, by Dr. G. B. Richards, 265; Answer to Inquiry, 265;
Book Reviews, edited by Prof. W. J. Chase, 266; Current Periodical Articles on the Teaching
of History, 270; Recent Historical Publications, listed by Dr. C. A. Coulomb, 270; Historical
Articles, in Recent Periodicals, listed by L. F. Stock, 271.

Published monthly, except July, August and September, by McKinley Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyrighted, 1919, McKinley Publishing Co. Entered as second-class matter, October 26, 1909, at Post-office at Phila., Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879



More than 2000 schools
are now using

Robinson, Breasted, and Beard's Outlines of European History

Parts I and II

either wholly or in part

With *Muzzey's American History* this series provides unequalled material for the three-year high school history course now so widely followed.

GINN AND COMPANY

Publishers

70 Fifth Avenue

New York

REASONS WHY Hart's New American History

IS WINNING FAVOR EVERYWHERE

The new perspective it gives on our foreign relations.

The proper subordination of military events to larger phases of our history.

The fulness and vividness with which it presents our social and economic development.

Above all, its refreshing freedom from provincialism, from sectional bias and from dogmatic statements.

710 Pages with colored illustrations and maps.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York Cincinnati Chicago Boston Atlanta

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Summer Session, 1919

JUNE 30 TO AUGUST 8

(Law School, June 23 to August 29)

320 COURSES. 160 INSTRUCTORS. Graduate and under-graduate work leading to the bachelor's and higher degrees. LETTERS AND SCIENCE, MEDICINE, ENGINEERING, LAW AND AGRICULTURE (including HOME ECONOMICS).

TEACHERS' COURSES in high school subjects. Strong programs in all academic departments. Exceptional research facilities.

SPECIAL FEATURES.—Agricultural Education; Americanization; Auto-engineering; Commercial and Industrial Geography; Commercial Correspondence and Advertising; Diplomacy of the War; Education; Festivals; French House; The Great War and Its Liquidation; History of the United States, 1898-1918; Heredity and Eugenics; Labor Problems and Industrial Service; Moral Education; Music; Practical Problems in Democracy; Romance Languages; School Relations; Vocational Education; The War and Political Reconstruction.

FAVORABLE CLIMATE. LAKESIDE ADVANTAGES.

One fee for all courses, \$15, except Law (10 weeks) \$25

For detailed announcements, address
Registrar, University, Madison, Wisconsin

Cornell University

SUMMER SESSION

July 5—August 15

The following courses are offered in History, Government, and Economics:

Greek and Roman History; Oriental History—Professor Nathaniel Schmidt.

Modern European History; Historical Background of the War of 1914—Professor Bernadotte Everly Schmitt (Western Reserve University).

English History to 1485; English History since 1815—Professor A. H. Sweet.

American History, 1815-1850; American History, 1865-1914; Seminary—Professor J. P. Bretz.

American Government; Social and Political Institutions—Professor R. G. Gettell (Amherst College).

Principles of Economics—Professor H. J. Davenport.

Money and Credit; Theory and History of Banking; Corporation Finance—Professor H. L. Reed.

Elements of Accounting; Principles of Accounting—Professor Donald English.

General Problems of Industrial History; Social Problems in England in the Nineteenth Century—Professor A. P. Usher.

Special Opportunities for Graduate Work.

Full program will be sent on application to the

Secretary of the Summer Session, Ithaca, N. Y.

FOR COLLEGE COURSES IN RECONSTRUCTION

Democracy in Reconstruction

Authoritative Discussions of After-War Problems

Edited by FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND and JOSEPH SCHAFER

*Student's Edition, \$1.50 postpaid***THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF RECONSTRUCTION IN AMERICA.**

By JOSEPH SCHAFER.

IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY.

FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND. W. W. WILLOUGHBY.

INSTITUTIONS OF DEMOCRACY.CARL KELSEY. ARTHUR JAMES TODD.
EDWARD CARY HAYES W. F. WILLOUGHBY**AFTER-WAR LABOR PROBLEMS.**

HAROLD G. MOULTON. WILLIAM F. OGBURN.

AFTER-WAR SOCIAL PROBLEMS.ESTHER CLAYSON LOVEJOY, M.D. MARY ELIZABETH TITZEL.
CHARLES R. MANN. SAMUEL P. CAPEN.
WILLIS H. CAROTHERS**AFTER-WAR TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS.**

FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND. ROBERT C. HARGREAVES.

Statement of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.**AFTER-WAR POLITICAL PROBLEMS.**CHESTER COLLINS MAXEY. FREDERIC C. YOUNG.
CHARLES A. BEARD.**HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY**

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

Harvard University

FORTY-NINTH SUMMER SESSION

July 1 - August 9, 1919 August 11 - Sept. 13, 1919

Courses in European History, History of France, English History, American History, and Special Work for Graduate Students.

Special Course of Daily Lectures during the first session of the Summer School on Problems of War and of Reconstruction. These lectures are open without fee to all members of the Summer School.

For further information apply to the Secretary of the

HARVARD SUMMER SCHOOL

19 University Hall

Cambridge, Massachusetts

University of Colorado

BOULDER, COLORADO

Announcement of a Summer Quarter

INSTEAD of the usual Summer Session of six weeks, the University of Colorado will conduct, in the summer of 1919, a Summer Quarter of two terms, greatly increasing the scope and variety of courses. The First Term will open on June 30 and close on August 2. The Second Term will open on August 4 and close on September 6. Courses will be offered in Liberal Arts, Law, Medicine, Ophthalmology, Engineering, Mountain Field Biology, and Vocational Subjects.

A bulletin, soon to be issued, containing descriptions of courses and other information, may be obtained by addressing the Registrar.

WEBSTER'S

Medieval and Modern History

THIS new book includes chapters on the World War and the conditions in Europe that led up to it. The treatment is characterized by the accuracy of statement and the charm of style that have combined to make the Webster Histories so popular. The last 400 pages, covering the history of the last 200 years, may be had in a separate volume, called Part III, Modern Times.

The Webster Series of Histories now includes the following:

Webster's Ancient History

From prehistoric times to the Age of Charlemagne

Webster's Early European History

From prehistoric times to the seventeenth century

Webster's Medieval and Modern History

From the fall of Rome to the present

Webster's Readings in Ancient History**Webster's Readings in Medieval and Modern History****Webster's European History****Part I — Ancient Times**

The Ancient History Section of the above book

Part II — Medieval and Early Modern Times

From the fall of Rome to the seventeenth century

Part III — Modern Times

From the Age of Louis XIV to the present

Correspondence Invited

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

ATLANTA

SAN FRANCISCO

ANNOUNCEMENT

of Policy and Contents of

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK

for 1919-1920

The policy, adopted by the editors several years ago, of using the knowledge of the past for an intelligent understanding of the present, will be continued in future issues of *THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK*. Among many articles of general interest the following may be mentioned:

Accounts of Recent Activities of Federal Departments and Administrations, similar in general character to the description of the Food Administration which appears in this issue.

Narratives of War Experiences of Historical Scholars, recounting not personal experiences, but the relation of scholars to the varied activities of war times. Historians have been active in war welfare work, in the work of the Committee of Public Information, in the Historical Branch of the General Staff, in the Military Intelligence work, in the Department of Justice, in the preparations for the Peace Conference, and in the actual administration of military and civic undertakings. A series of interesting descriptions of such experiences will be published in *THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK* beginning in the fall of 1919.

Historical Interpretations of current events, such as those which have appeared from the pen of Professor Larson in the last five issues, will be continued.

Current Historical Documents and summaries will be presented. In the forthcoming June issue there will appear a valuable general summary of the work of the War Congress from April, 1917, to March, 1919.

Aids to Historical Specialists and History Teachers will continue to occupy a large amount of the space in the paper. In addition to the bibliographical features which have been running in *THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK*, a monthly list of historical articles in current periodicals will be printed. This list and the list of current historical publications will be of much value to librarians, history teachers and historical scholars.

Readers and subscribers to *THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK* are requested to co-operate with the management in bringing the paper to the attention of persons who would be interested in its contents. Sample copies will be cheerfully sent to any address and a **THREE MONTHS' TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION** can be obtained by new subscribers for **FIFTY CENTS**.

McKINLEY PUBLISHING CO.

1619 RANSTEAD STREET

PHILADELPHIA

The Historical Outlook

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine

Volume X.
Number 5.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1919.

\$2.00 a year.
25 cents a copy.

Japan and the Great War

BY PAYSON JACKSON TREAT, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY.

Reprinted from *The League of Nations*, by permission of the World Peace Foundation.

I. WHY JAPAN ENTERED THE GREAT WAR.

On August 23, 1914, Japan declared war upon Germany. She was thus the fourth of the Allies to enter the Great War, and the first power outside of Europe. Four days later Austria-Hungary declared war on her. Japan later was one of the five powers to adhere to the pact of London, joining with Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy in a declaration not to make a separate peace. Thus Japan, from the early days of the war, was one of the Allies in the strictest sense of the term.

The reason for Japan's action is not hard to find. Primarily it was based upon a fine sense of honor and the readiness in the fullest sense to meet the obligations of a treaty. In this respect the contrast between the conduct of Germany and of Japan is sharply defined from the beginning. But as human actions are rarely the result of single factors, so there were other underlying motives, in which the conduct of Germany in the Far East and the development of Japan's Asiatic policy were involved.

The Anglo-Japanese alliance was first formulated in 1902.¹ It was the direct result of the Far Eastern policy of Russia, which threatened the interests of both powers in North China and Korea. During the Boxer uprising in 1900 and the subsequent negotiations, British and Japanese military and diplomatic representatives worked in harmony, and thus a good understanding paved the way for a formal alliance. This was a surprising step for Great Britain to take. It was the first alliance entered into by her since the Crimean War, and it brought to an end the days of her proud isolation. It proved to be but the first step in her new foreign policy, and soon was followed by the French entente in 1904 and the Russian entente in 1907. And all three of them served to unite the four great powers in an understanding which reacted immediately to the German threat in 1914. But in many quarters, the alliance was denounced as an unprecedented union of a western and an eastern state, a Christian and a Pagan one, and Germany has never lost an opportunity to dwell upon the treason of Great Britain to the cause of "civilization." The

first treaty called for joint action only when two powers combined to threaten the interests of Britain or Japan in the East, and this gave Japan the assurance that should Russia attack her, Great Britain, controlling the seas, would "hold the ring" and see that no other European power intervened, as had been the case after the Chino-Japanese War in 1895. And this is exactly what happened. Although the Kaiser sympathized with Russia during the Japanese War and deliberately broke international law in order to help coal the Russian fleet,² yet he dared not openly join her so long as Britain was ready to meet her obligations under the Japanese alliance.

It might be added that there was some question among Japanese statesmen as to whether an English or a Russian alliance would be most helpful. Prince Ito believed it would be better to ally with Russia, to work with her and endeavor to avoid friction. But the Japanese cabinet believed, and wisely, that Japan had far more in common with Great Britain than with the then government of Russia, which had already shown its cynical disregard for its plighted word.

During the Russo-Japanese War, 1905, the terms of the alliance were altered, and now both parties would join forces if the interests of either were attacked, and as the scope of the alliance extended to India it now became possible for Britain to reduce greatly her eastern fleet and commence the concentration in the North Sea which served so well in 1914. The last renewal of the alliance was in 1911 and the terms were again altered in order to permit the operation of arbitration treaties, and especially those which the United States had proposed to the powers.

Since 1902 the alliance with Great Britain has been the corner-stone of Japanese foreign policy. In spite of criticism on the part of certain British and Japanese journalists and of narrow-minded politicians in both countries, the statesmen of the two empires have realized the value of this compact, which, as the Japanese liked to say, assured the peace of the Far East. And the existence of this agreement was often overlooked during the period of friction between Japan and the United States before the

¹ The text of the alliance and the history of its origin are given in "The Background of the War," 202-204, 242-246 (*A League of Nations*, I, No. 4).

² Herman Bernstein, "The Willy-Nicky Correspondence," 57-59, 60-73, 78-81, 90-102 (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1918).

Great War. Japan, allied with Great Britain, could hardly think of forcing any issue with the country with which Britain had most in common. Instead of seeking to make trouble, Japan, as we shall see, sought to improve her good relations with the two great English-speaking powers.

The vital clause of the alliance provided that, should the territorial rights or special interests of either power in Eastern Asia or India be threatened, the two allies would unite in their defense. If the Japanese had been inclined to a strict interpretation of their obligations it would have been easy to assert that the presence of German raiders in the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the existence of a German base on the coast of China did not seriously affect the territorial rights of Britain, and that only when India or the other eastern possessions of Great Britain were attacked would Japan have to intervene. But if this idea ever occurred to the Japanese statesmen it certainly did not delay their action. And in addition to the formal obligations of the alliance it was felt that Japan's own interests prompted her to enter the world war.

GERMANY IN THE FAR EAST.

For the past 20 years Germany had been the stormy petrel of Far Eastern politics. It was Germany that arranged for the triple demonstration of Germany, Russia and France at the close of the Chino-Japanese War, which robbed Japan of Port Arthur and the Liaotung Peninsula. It was Germany that commenced the vicious circle of territorial demands on China, when, with the worst excuse in the world, she extorted the lease of the fine port of Kiaochow, just across the Yellow Sea from Japan. It was the Kaiser who gave to the world the bogey of the "Yellow Peril." It was Germany who behaved so badly during the Boxer uprising and the peace negotiations. It was believed that it was the Kaiser who encouraged the Tsar in his fatal Manchurian policy, which cost Japan so much in blood and treasure. And at Tsingtao (the city on the Bay of Kiaochow) Germany had built up a strong naval base which might be used for strengthening her hold upon China, or even against Japan herself. Japan, therefore, had no love for Germany. With Germany she had been able to come to no understanding, although she had an alliance with Great Britain and ententes with France and Russia. The elimination of Germany from China would fit in with Japan's new policy of checking foreign aggression there. But without the Anglo-Japanese alliance it is very doubtful if Japan would have promptly entered the European War. In my mind there is no doubt that Japan would soon have been drawn into it when Germany began her raids upon neutral shipping. But the idea that at any time Japan would have joined with Germany against the Allies is so absurd that it existed only in German minds or in the minds of German sympathizers. The last power in the world, of all the belligerents, that Japan would have fought was Great Britain. And as we have seen, she had understandings with both France and Russia.

The talk of a German-Japanese alliance was made in Berlin and was primarily intended to affect such anti-Japanese sentiment as existed in the United States.

ULTIMATUM TO GERMANY.

As soon as the news of Great Britain's declaration of war against Germany on August 4, 1914, reached Japan, she notified her Ally that she was ready to live up to the terms and duties of the alliance. Britain promptly made a formal request for Japanese aid. A few days elapsed while the Japanese studied the problem and perfected their plans. Finally, it was decided that she would help police the eastern seas, would drive Germany out of her naval base at Tsingtao, and would capture her islands in the South Seas. On the 15th, a formal notice was served upon Germany that she must surrender the entire leased territory of Kiaochow to Japan, for eventual restoration to China, and she was given until the 23d to reply. On that date, when the only answer Germany made was to strengthen the defenses and concentrate her reservists at Tsingtao, Japan formally declared war. This was promptly followed by the sailing forth of Japanese ships to run down German commerce destroyers and by a naval bombardment of Tsingtao.

II. JAPAN'S PART IN THE WAR.

The operations at Tsingtao were insignificant from a military point of view. The port was well fortified, but the garrison consisted of only some 4,500 men. Japan sent over an expeditionary force of 20,000, and Great Britain co-operated with 925 British and 800 Sikh troops. In order to get at the German territory it was necessary to land on Chinese soil. This was a violation of neutrality, and was promptly decried by the Germans as on a par with the invasion of Belgium. Naturally, there was no comparison. Germany was by treaty bound not only to respect but to defend the neutrality of Belgium. But China was too weak to prevent the Germans, on her territory, from violating neutrality, and it was incumbent on the Allies to do what China herself could not do. There would have been no attack on Tsingtao if the Germans had not used it as a base of naval operations. It should also be remembered that the Russo-Japanese War was fought almost entirely on Chinese soil. In both cases it was the price she had to pay for permitting militant powers to hold and fortify leaseholds in her territory.

The investment of Tsingtao proceeded slowly, for the Japanese were unwilling to sacrifice many lives in gaining an assured victory. Finally, on November 7, after the Japanese had taken the dominant forts, the German commander surrendered. The prisoners were soon removed to Japan, where their lot was so different from that of prisoners of war in Germany that any comparison would be odious. And throughout the whole period the Japanese showed no bitterness toward the German residents in Japan. It was only when their courtesy was abused that they began to intern recalcitrant Germans.

NAVAL OPERATIONS.

On the high seas the Japanese navy had been ceaselessly active. Their squadron scoured the Pacific from Canada to Cape Horn. Other vessels served as convoys for the Australian troop-ships on their way to Egypt and the Dardanelles, and many an Australian who had dreamed of the Japanese invasion of Australia saw for the first time the sun-flag of Japan on the ships which protected him and his comrades from the German cruisers. During this time a Japanese cruiser ran aground off the Mexican coast, and the German propaganda in this country incited a great hue and cry that Japan had established a naval base to the south of California. This report was investigated by an American naval officer and the real situation reported.

It was a Japanese squadron also which swept down the South American coast searching for Von Spee's fleet, which had destroyed a smaller British force off Chile. Happily, for the satisfaction of the British navy, the Japanese drove the Germans into the Atlantic, where at the Falkland Islands the British fell upon them and destroyed them every one.

By understanding with Great Britain, the Japanese captured the German islands north of the equator, while British colonial forces occupied German New Guinea and Samoa. The Japanese took and garrisoned the Marshall and Caroline Islands in October, 1914.

With the destruction of all the German raiders and their bases, the naval operations were practically at an end. But it was the Japanese and British vessels which kept the Pacific free from the horrors of submarine warfare such as the Atlantic was soon to know.

Later services were those rendered at Singapore when an Indian regiment, incited by German propagandists, mutinied. And after Japanese merchant vessels were submarined in the Mediterranean Japan sent a torpedo-boat flotilla to those waters, where they rendered efficient service until the end of the war. In effect this was a participation in the war in Europe.

MILITARY SUPPLIES FURNISHED RUSSIA.

But a greater, although far less spectacular, service was rendered in supplying Russia with military materials of all description as long as she remained in the war. With only one port of entry on the west, at Archangel, Russia had to depend more and more upon the goods made in Japan and shipped over the Trans-Siberian railway. Not only did the Japanese government arsenals and factories work at full blast, but the authorities encouraged private concerns to make every effort to supply the Russian needs. As a result Russia received invaluable help, and the Japanese hold some hundred millions of doubtful securities. But if this help had been denied, the collapse of Russia would have come long before it did. It would be an interesting, but hardly profitable study to estimate what would have been the effect if Japan had been bound by a German alliance. Russia would have had to mobilize a large army in the

Far East, the British colonials would hardly have dared leave their own lands, and the commerce of the Pacific would have passed out of the control of the Allies.

III. WHY JAPAN SENT NO TROOPS TO EUROPE.

These positive contributions of Japan to the Allies' cause have frequently been overlooked, and during the first three years of the war the question was often asked: Why has Japan not sent a force to Europe? In considering this question we should first of all remember that Japan was primarily charged with the maintenance of peace in the Far East and its adjacent seas. To send a force to Europe, to France or to Russia, Japan should receive a formal request from the Allies. There is no evidence that such was made.

Instead, early in 1915, a number of articles appeared in French newspapers and reviews advocating Japanese participation. To a less extent the question was discussed in Great Britain. Among the French publicists who urged this were M. Pichon, formerly minister of foreign affairs, and M. Clemenceau, former premier and later in office at the close of the war. These proposals, which it must be remembered were informal and unofficial, generally called for the landing of a Japanese force of about half a million men in the Balkan Peninsula to co-operate with Serbia. Another proposal suggested that the Japanese move across the Trans-Siberian railway and join the Russian armies.

CONFLICTING VIEWS.

These discussions naturally were echoed in Japan. At once a considerable divergence of opinion was expressed both there and abroad. First of all, it was held that Japan should not take part in the European battles unless her aid was absolutely essential to victory. The war began primarily as a European conflict. A sound psychology demanded, in the early period, that the armies of European states, aided by their colonies, should triumph over the Central Powers. To bring in a large force of Japanese would give the Germans a sentimental argument for use in neutral countries, and especially in America. This was realized by responsible Entente statesmen. And as to the eastern front, the Japanese, with a fine sense of propriety, appreciated that it was too soon after the Russian War for them to assume that without their aid the Russians would be defeated. Some resentment was manifested in Japan at the idea that Japanese soldiers were desired in order to spare the European troops. For it must not be forgotten that from every calculation the man-power of the Allies far surpassed that of the Central Powers. As long as Russia remained in the field the eastern front could be supported best by supplies rather than men, and Japan made every effort to meet this need. It was not until after the collapse of Russia that the question of man-power became a serious one with the Allies. But before that day the United States had entered the field, and she could place men in Europe much faster and more easily than could Japan. The

general view in Japan, except among a few outspoken advocates of the Allies' cause, was that she should thoroughly perform her duties in the Far East, and should adopt a policy of "watchful waiting" in regard to sending a force to Europe, although prepared to participate if her man-power were formally desired.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES.

The sending of a force to Europe, therefore, never passed out of the stage of discussion. But in that stage certain very practical difficulties were presented. First of all was the question of transport. When we remember how every resource of ocean transportation was called upon to convey the American armies across the relatively narrow Atlantic, we can understand the almost insoluble difficulties presented in moving a force from Japan to Europe. From Yokohama to Marseilles, via the Suez Canal, is over 9,000 marine miles; from Yokohama to Bordeaux, via Panama, is over 12,000; from New York to Bordeaux is only 3,187. Given an equal number of transports, of equal size and speed, it would take three or four times as much tonnage to land a Japanese army in Europe as it would an American one of the same size. But the transportation facilities in the Far East could not be compared with those on the Atlantic. In 1914, the merchant marine of Japan numbered 168 steamers of over 3,000 tons, with a total of 922,020 tons. She possessed only eight ships of over 10,000 tons. This tonnage was worked to the fullest capacity to carry on the trade abandoned by British and other Allies' ships because of the military needs of the Entente. It requires little insight to understand that, as long as the man-power of the Allies remained superior to that of Germany, the very best use that Japan could make of her tonnage was in supplying the Allies with food and materials. The effect of withdrawing all the large Japanese vessels for transport services would have been lamentable. But if she withdrew one-third of her available tonnage, say 300,000 tons, this would only suffice to transport and maintain 50,000 Japanese in Europe, if the moderate allowance of six tons per man were made. While British and requisitioned German tonnage has carried the bulk of the American troops to Europe, little help could have been found in those quarters for Japan. From every point of view, therefore, the transportation of an effective Japanese force to Europe seemed out of the question. But if it became absolutely necessary, then the tonnage could have been diverted, the Far Eastern trade allowed to lapse, the civilians of Europe and of Japan placed on a starvation allowance, so that Japan might throw her reserves of men into the European field. Fortunately, the war was brought to a close before such a need developed.

And a similar situation existed on the eastern front. The only means of transportation between Japan and European Russia was the Trans-Siberian railway, over 5,000 miles long. This was worked to fullest capacity to convey the supplies to the Russian front

from Vladivostok. As long as Russia had hundreds of thousands of soldiers without equipment, was it not sound policy to use the railroad for transporting supplies rather than for transporting unneeded man-power which would in turn need more supplies? With the establishment of Bolshevik control in Russia, their abandonment of the Allies, and their treachery to both the Rumanians and the Czecho-Slovak troops, the Japanese were profoundly grateful that no desire for glory had caused a Japanese force to be left at the mercy of the Germans and Bolsheviks five thousand miles from their base.

Of all the practical difficulties, that connected with transportation was the most insoluble. But two others were presented. First, was that of the expense involved. No one of the five Allies was so unprepared to finance a costly war as was Japan. She was still groaning under the burden of taxation due to the Russian War, which only ended in 1905. In 1914, the national debt of Japan amounted to over \$1,250,000,000. About 25 per cent. of the annual expenditure of the state went to paying interest. The people had borne, with increasing unrest, a burden of taxation which Americans in time of peace would have deemed unthinkable. A study of the fiscal system shows how the Government had been compelled to tap almost every conceivable source of revenue.³ Such unpopular taxes as the salt monopoly, the textile, business and transit taxes called for readjustment. One economist estimated that 44 per cent. of the people's income went for taxes. And when the low standard of living is borne in mind, the fact that in 1914 the highest skilled labor received only about 50 cents a day, while the farm laborer received \$27.00 a year, we can understand that for the poorest of the Allies to have conducted one of the most expensive operations would have been more than any one could ask, unless the need was absolutely imperative. To be sure, the Japanese soldiers would be paid little, and their food would be cheap, but all the implements of warfare would cost her as much as any other state, while transport would cost more. Farm laborers earning \$27.00 a year can hardly bear the burden of a modern war as well as Americans whose earnings in a similar capacity would run from six to nine hundred dollars, with food and lodging provided.

The second problem was the equipment of the Japanese army. As far as man-power went the Japanese possessed a very effective force. But the Great War was largely a war of machinery. Japan was hopelessly deficient in airplanes, motor transports, artillery and machine guns. In her last war, with Russia, man-power counted for much, but in the Great War man-power had to be re-enforced by unheard-of quantities of guns, airships and motors. At the outbreak of the war Japan did not possess a single automobile factory. To equip an expedition-

³ For details of Japanese finances see the plates prefixed to the Seventeenth Financial and Economic Annual of Japan, 1917. The Department of Finance (Tokyo, Government Printing Office, 1917).

ary force she would have had to fall back upon the overworked factories of Europe and America. That fact in itself indicates one of the great problems which the Japanese staff would have had to face.

IV. THE SIBERIAN EXPEDITION.

In March of this year an entirely new question was presented by the action of the Bolsheviki representatives in signing the wretched treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Russia thus withdrew from the war, breaking the pact of London signed by the Tsar's Government. The eastern front had collapsed—not only was Germany free to mass most of her divisions on the west for her strenuous offensives which so promptly commenced, but there was the immediate danger of her overrunning Russia and exploiting such stores of food and supplies as might be found. Japan at once consulted her Allies as to what should be done under these new conditions. Three plans were unofficially considered. First, the immediate landing of a Japanese force to take possession of the vast amount of military supplies piled up at Vladivostok; secondly, the sending of an expeditionary force to seize the Trans-Siberian railway and thus prevent a German advance to the east, if such were attempted. This also called for the recapture and disarmament of the Austro-Hungarian and German prisoners in Siberia, who had been released and armed by the Bolsheviki. And, thirdly, the endeavor to restore the eastern front—but this plan was recognized as impossible from the start. It was difficult to know what was best to be done because of the abnormal conditions in Russia. But one thing was certain, and that was that Japan would not act without the advice and approval of her Allies, especially Great Britain and the United States. In Japan the discussion was complicated because of a bitter political controversy then raging, and any decision of the Teruchi ministry was bound to provoke criticism, largely of a political nature.

The first step was taken on April 5, when a small force of sailors was landed at Vladivostok to protect life and property there, after a Japanese had been killed and two wounded by Russians. This was followed by the landing of British and later American sailors. In this way the great port of Vladivostok and the supplies there came under the control of the Allies. For the next few months there was indecision. President Wilson then considered the problem and used his strong influence in favor of moderate measures. A new turn was given to the discussion when the Czecho-Slovak troops began to appear at Vladivostok, after having fought their way across Siberia, leaving most of their numbers embattled behind them.

DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN PLAN.

By August 3 the American proposal had been formulated and adopted by Japan. It called for the dispatch of a joint expeditionary force to Siberia to rescue the Czecho-Slovak troops from the German and Austro-Hungarian armed prisoners. Further-

more, this military assistance would "steady any efforts at self-government or self-defense in which the Russians themselves may be willing to accept assistance." In addition the United States proposed to send to Siberia a commission of merchants, agricultural experts, labor advisers, Red Cross representatives and agents of the Young Men's Christian Association in order in some systematic way to relieve the immediate economic necessities of the people there. Statements were issued in Tokyo and in Washington defining the scope of the joint expedition.⁴ The Japanese document contained this pledge: "They reaffirm their avowed policy of respecting the territorial integrity of Russia, and of abstaining from all interference in her internal politics. They further declare that upon the realization of the objects above indicated, they will immediately withdraw all Japanese troops from Russian territory, and will leave wholly unimpaired the sovereignty of Russia in all its phases, whether political or military."

JAPAN'S CONTRIBUTION.

Steps were at once taken to carry out these plans. The Japanese contingent was commanded by General Otani, who became the commander-in-chief of the joint force. Two American regiments were hurried up from the Philippines and Major-General Graves led the first troops across from the United States. After some fighting along the Amur River, the Allies and the Czecho-Slovaks were able to disperse the combined Bolsheviki-German-Austrian forces. Almost all the former prisoners were disarmed and placed under restraint, the Czecho-Slovak troops were rescued, and the Trans-Siberian railroad opened for its whole length. At present an All-Russian Council is in session in Omsk which has been recognized by the Allies. What the future holds for Russia no one can say, whether order will soon be restored or whether a long period of military occupation may be necessary. But so far as Japan is concerned, we can say that she has co-operated cordially and loyally with her Allies and with the United States in Siberia, and any future decisions will be reached as in the past, through friendly discussion, and, if necessary, mutual concession.

If any one had prophesied, five or six years ago, that soldiers of the United States and of Japan would soon be fighting side by side against a European foe, he would have been laughed into silence. For at that time our relations with Germany and Austria were of the best, whereas on several occasions a rumor of war with Japan had been current in many quarters in the United States. What, then, have been the relations between the United States and Japan in the past, and what foundation has there been for alarmist reports which have dismayed many of the people of the two countries?

⁴ For the texts of the statements, see "The Supreme War Council," 413-416 (*A League of Nations*, I, No. 7).

The Synchronization of Chinese and Occidental History

BY PROFESSOR K. S. LATOURETTE, DENISON UNIVERSITY.

The past few years have forced us to think of the world as a whole. Nations can no longer live in water-tight compartments. If our history teaching is to parallel this development and train our students for the new age we must enlarge the scope of our courses and have them deal with the race as a whole, and not exclusively with its Occidental sections. This must certainly be the case when we teach the nineteenth century, and it may also be done to advantage in connection with our work in ancient, medieval, and early modern history. If, for example, we do no more than pause from time to time in our narration of European events to call attention to contemporary conditions in the other great centers of civilization, the Near East, India, and the Far East, we will have done something to broaden the horizon of our students without adding overmuch to the congestion from which our courses are already apt to suffer.

Particularly does the development of the Chinese people lend itself to this kind of treatment. Here we have a great culture, nearly as old as that of the Mediterranean world, almost entirely distinct from it, and to-day affecting not only the fourth or fifth of the human race which inhabits China, but the sixty millions or so of the Japanese Empire. The dawn of Chinese civilization goes back at least to the thirteenth or twelfth century before Christ, and so is later than the culture of the Nile and Tigris-Euphrates valleys. While the later Hebrew prophets and the earlier Greek philosophers were laying the foundations for Occidental religious and philosophic thought, Chinese philosophers were wrestling with the problems of existence and moral conduct, and systems were being evolved which from that time to this have shaped Chinese conduct and ideals. Lao Tzu, preacher of inaction and the founder of the semi-mystical Taoism, belongs to the sixth century before Christ, and Confucius, who more than any other has determined the ethical standards of China, was born in 551 and died in 479 B. C. He was a contemporary of Gautama Buddha, and died a few years before the birth of Socrates. Mencius, next to their originator, the greatest early protagonist and expounder of Confucian doctrines, lived and taught in the fourth century before Christ, and was junior to Plato by over fifty years. He was one of a group of brilliant thinkers who were grappling with the problems of conduct and of human existence. He taught, for example, that mankind was by nature good, and battled manfully with rivals who either declared that the moral inheritance of the child was entirely bad or a mixture of good and evil. The three hundred years, from approximately 600 to 250 B. C., were the great creative periods of Chinese thought.

While Rome was laying the foundations of her imperial sway, the discendant states that formed the

older China were being brought under the iron rule of Ch'in Shih Hwang Ti, the monarch who conquered the empire and laid the foundations for its permanent unity. His reign lasted from B. C. 255 to B. C. 206, fifty years as fraught with momentous consequences for China as any period of similar length in her long history. He was, it is well to remember, a contemporary of Hannibal.

Ch'in Shih Hwang Ti's centralized bureaucracy proved too drastic and his descendants feeble, so that it was left to the Han dynasty (206 B. C. to 221 A. D.) to work out a compromise between his centralized autocracy and the feudal particularism which preceded him. The Han emperors not only gave China the political organization which with modifications lasted to our own day, but brought under their sway most of what is now China proper, Southern Mongolia and Manchuria, and the New Territory. Their dominions were probably nearly, although not quite, as populous and extensive as their contemporary, the Roman empire, and were not so far short of the latter in the machinery of government and the arts of peace and war.

Like its Occidental contemporary, the Han empire collapsed partly because of internal decay and partly because of the pressure of invaders. The peoples from Central Asia who played so large a part in the barbarian inroads in the Western world, and who in the person of the Mongols and the Turks were later to cause so much trouble in Western Asia and Eastern and Southern Europe, also figure largely in Chinese annals. They or their cousins were a perpetual menace to the rulers of the Middle Kingdom. From 221-589 they harassed North China, and the country was divided into petty states, which at times found it hard to resist them. Like the Occident, China was impressionable during these years, and the Indian-born Buddhism established itself as one of the faiths of the land.

China recovered more rapidly from her partial collapse than did Western Europe, and from 618 to 907 was united under the T'ang dynasty. This line of strong rulers extended the bounds of the empire more widely than had their predecessors of Han times, and under their benign sway art and literature flourished, and wealth and population increased. In T'ang times China was in all probability the most highly cultured, the most populous, the wealthiest, and the most extensive state in the globe, much more so than its contemporary, the Carolingian empire, and even more so than the Byzantine domains and the Caliphate. Persia sought its aid against the expanding Mohammedan power, and its civilization penetrated to Japan, and provided a model on which was formed the political organization and the culture of the vigorous islanders. Japan is almost as truly the child of

China as is modern northern Europe of the Roman empire.

The T'ang emperors were succeeded by approximately fifty years of internal disorder and ephemeral dynasties. There then appeared on the scenes the Sung dynasty (960-1280) parallel to the Norman Conquest of England, most of the Crusades, the rise of European universities, and the flowering of medieval culture in the varied and wonderful thirteenth century. The paintings of the Sung dynasty are superior to their European contemporaries, although China has nothing to match the Gothic Cathedral. Two generations before Thomas Aquinas gave form to medieval theology, Chu Hsi was producing interpretations to the Confucian classics, and elaborating a philosophical system which was to be held as orthodox by Chinese scholars until the dawn of the twentieth century. Wang An Shih, a contemporary of William the Conqueror, thought out and for a time put into practice a form of radical governmental and economic reorganization which in some respects anticipated the programs of radical social thinkers of the modern Occident. A little before the Universities of Paris and Bologna took form, foundations for research and higher education were being founded which have lasted to our own day.

The Mongol irruption into Europe was accompanied by the complete conquest of China by the same virile warriors, and Kublai Khan founded a dynasty which ruled from Cambalue (Peking) from 1280 to 1368. Under these Mongol emperors extensive intercourse was carried on with the West, both overland and with the Arabs on the south coast of China. Franciscan missionaries established themselves in some of the chief cities of the realm, and Italian merchants, among them the Polos, were to be found in Fukkien and Peking. China under the name of Cathay became widely known in the West. Indeed, it was partly the hope of finding a sea route to it that started the mariners of Henry the Navigator on their quest, and that urged Columbus on his voyages to the West.

Of the Ming dynasty, the native Chinese line which in 1368 supplanted the Mongols, but little need be said, except perhaps to note that it was with these anti-foreign rulers that the Portuguese merchants and missionaries came in contact when they followed the Arabs to Canton. It is well to remember, however, that while the foundations of the English colonies were being laid in North America the Ming power was weakening, and was to give way in 1644 to the Manchu conquerors from the North. The earlier of these alien rulers were extremely able men. They pushed the boundaries of China to the Amur, the Continental divide that forms the present boundary between the Russian domains and the Chinese empire, and to the Himalayas, and Chinese suzerainty was established over Burma and what is now Tonking and Annam. K'ang Hsi (1662-1723) was a contemporary of Louis XIV and Ch'ien Lung (1736-1796) of Frederick the Great and Catherine of Russia. Both these Chinese monarchs were as able as any of their European contemporaries, and ruled over more populous realms. It is doubtful whether any Western kingdom of the eighteenth century was governed as well as was China under these great Manchu emperors. It is only within the past hundred and twenty-five years that European states have been stronger than China. When we are impressed with the present weakness of that great land it is well to remember that Occidental aggression coincided with the declining days of a foreign dynasty, and that it has been less than a hundred years since in the salutary of the first volume of the American Philosophical Society appeared the statement: "Could we be so fortunate as to introduce the industry of the Chinese, their arts of living, and improvements in husbandry, . . . America might in time become as populous as China." In the new day when the world has become one, China may again find herself, and in doing so may make rich contribution to the united life of the race. Meantime, it is the duty of the rest of mankind to strive to understand her and to see that she has a fair chance.

The Revolution in Hungary

BY PROFESSOR LAURENCE M. LARSON, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

I.

Since the collapse of the "ramshackle empire" of the Hapsburgs in October of last year, the press dispatches have not had much to say about the course events were taking in Hungary. The conflict between Slavs and Italians on the Adriatic coast has been discussed from week to week, and such news as has been sent across from Prague or Vienna has been studied with interest; but whether it was the correspondent or the censor who was at fault, the reading public did not realize that important developments were going forward in the land of the Magyars.

And then suddenly, in the last week of March, the

attention of the world was drawn to Hungary and centered at Budapest. Another republic had apparently surrendered to Bolshevism. Count Karolyi, the president of Hungary, had given up his office and had entrusted the government to the representatives of the proletariat.

In nearly every case the revolutionary movements of 1917 and 1918 had found their active leadership in the lower strata of the middle class. Kerensky the lawyer from Turkestan, Ebert the saddlemaker from Heidelberg, Masaryk the Bohemian professor, Lenin the agitator from Simbirsk, to mention only a few of the more important leaders, must all be rated

as commoners. The movement in Hungary, however, proves an interesting exception; the Magyar republic came into being largely through the persistent efforts of a prominent member of the Hungarian aristocracy, Count Michael Karolyi.

Fortune has been kind to Count Michael. From the Karolyi family he inherited great wealth, social prestige, and certain definite political traditions. His marriage to the daughter of Julius Andrássy (the "Black Count" who played such a large part in the affairs of the Hapsburg monarchy during the second half of the nineteenth century) added strength to an influence that was already considerable. It seemed inevitable that the tall, handsome aristocrat should find a career in the field of politics.

Unfortunately an accident that he suffered in childhood had left his organs of speech somewhat impaired. The oratorical art is highly prized in Hungary, and the Karolyi family doubted the advisability of seeking membership in the diet for one who could, perhaps, never become a successful public speaker. It was therefore decided that young Michael should let politics alone and remain a country magnate.

But in this decision the family reckoned without Michael, who had determined to win fame in the legislative halls of Budapest. And he has realized his ambition in the fullest measure; by long and laborious practice he has even succeeded in becoming a real orator.

Count Karolyi began his career in the diet as an ultra-conservative; at one time he was a prominent leader among the Agrarians, a group that stood firmly for the old order of things. But a few years later he took a seat on the left and became prominent in the opposition. His "conversion" to radicalism was due in part to temperament and in part to circumstances. Karolyi is reckless, opinionated, and somewhat erratic; consequently the conservatives did not regard him as a safe leader. He had, moreover, incurred the ill-will of some of the magnates, among them Tisza, with whom he fought a duel. Finding the door of promotion shut on the right, he boldly moved over to the left and placed his wealth and his talents at the disposal of the radicals.

On one subject he was always insistent: Hungary must separate from Austria and resume her place among the independent nations of Europe. Shortly before the war he toured the United States in the interest of Hungarian independence. On this tour he sought out especially the more important Hungarian settlements, where he was naturally received with sympathy and enthusiasm.

II.

During the war Count Karolyi became the leader of the pacifist elements among the Magyars, and boldly urged a separate peace. His activities in this direction were carried on chiefly from Switzerland, but his share in them was well known, and at one time only the influence of the Karolyi and Andrássy families saved him from prosecution for treason.

On October 16, 1918, he rose in the chamber of deputies with a new demand for a separate peace. Two days later he rose again, this time to attack the very foundations of the government, the diet and the monarchy, the speedy downfall of which he boldly prophesied. He also condemned the alliance with Germany as "inimical to a league of nations." He agreed with his enemy Tisza that the war was lost, but he believed that peace might yet be saved.

A few days later (October 21) he made a formal motion looking toward definite separation from Austria, but the proposal was rejected. Karolyi's mind was already busied with thoughts of revolution, and he calmly informed the diet that if it preferred not to act in this matter, he should lead a movement himself.

The following ten days all was confusion in Budapest. Karolyi had organized a National Council, the membership of which comprised representatives of nearly all classes and parties except the more conservative; and this body became the chief instrument of the revolution. Soldiers' Councils were also organized, but when the crisis came these were found working with and even subject to the orders of the national council. The emperor tried to mediate between the legal authorities and the revolutionists, but without success. Karolyi demanded ministerial authority. The emperor was forced to yield, and on the night of October 30-31 a Karolyi ministry was formed, and the leader of the revolutionary party was formally invested with the control of the Hungarian state.

The new administration found three great problems waiting for solution: (1) the war must be ended; (2) the government of Hungary must be reorganized; (3) Hungary must be saved from partition. The Count attacked all these problems with hope and resolution; but the outcome was bitter disappointment.

His first purpose was to end the war. A week earlier (October 24) his father-in-law, Count Andrássy, had succeeded Burian as the common foreign minister of the dual monarchy. Five days later he began to negotiate for an armistice. But Karolyi could not wait for generals and diplomats; when his ministry was still only a day old, his secretary of war ordered the Hungarian soldiers to lay down their arms, and hostilities ceased.

It was Karolyi's belief that Hungary, after November 1, was to be regarded as a neutral; and he was deeply chagrined to find that the French commander in the Near East was not disposed to accept this view. He had also trusted that, since Hungary was now administered and controlled by one who had opposed the war and had long been known as an enthusiastic friend of the French, the Allies would gladly permit the importation of food for the needy and coal for the industries of the state; but in this, too, he was disappointed.

On the day that Hungary withdrew from the war, Count Karolyi began to plan for the establishment of an independent Magyar republic. Having called

into conference the members of the executive committee of the national council he informed them that Emperor Charles had released the members of the ministry from their oaths. It is not reported that any action was taken that day (November 1), but it seems likely that some sort of an understanding may have been reached. By this time Hungary had, in addition to the two councils referred to above, similar bodies of organized workmen (peasants' councils came later). These various bodies all tried to control the new government. The premier balked at this, and on November 4 an agreement was reached, according to which the substance of the power was to remain with Karolyi and his cabinet.

On November 16, exactly a week after the birth of the German republic, a similar form of government was established at Budapest. In many respects the German and the Magyar movements have a parallel history, but in certain other respects they differ materially. The Hungarian revolt was more carefully planned and was carried forward more deliberately and more logically than the revolution in Berlin.

(1) Late in the forenoon of that day the chamber of deputies met for its final session. After a brief discussion, in which the revolutionists took the leading part, the chamber voted to dissolve and adjourned.

(2) A little later in the morning the chamber of magnates assembled. The attendance was small—the Hungarian lords did not care to be present at the last hours of their ancient legislative body. In this case there was no formal adjournment; the members simply left the hall and a story of many centuries came to a close.

(3) During the same hour a national assembly convened for the occasion was also in session. In this meeting the principal addresses were made by Michael Karolyi and John Hock, the energetic president of the national council. The former announced his program to be reorganization along national, democratic, and social lines. The assembly accepted the plans of the ministry, voted to establish a republic, and empowered Karolyi and his associates to carry on the government in co-operation with the executive committee of the national council until a constituent assembly could be convened.

The assembly then adjourned to the steps of the parliament building, where Karolyi proclaimed the new republic. It was to be founded, he said, on the broad basis of liberty, justice, and labor. More specifically, he promised (1) the restoration of peace; (2) civil rights to all in full measure; (3) land for the peasantry. It was a simple program, but viewed against the background of Magyar society, it looks formidable and revolutionary.

Karolyi now addressed himself to the third problem, the matter of future boundaries. The kingdom of Hungary comprises an area of about 150,000 square miles, and supports a population of nearly 20,000,000. Of this number less than 9,000,000 are Magyars. In the west and southwest the population

is Jugo-Slavic. In the southeast (Transylvania) the Rumanians are in the majority, though this region has also an important Magyar element. In the Carpathian mountains in the north and northeast are important settlements of Slovaks and Ruthenians. But in spite of the fact that outside their own territories on the great Danubian plain the Magyars were in the minority, they had managed for centuries to control these non-Magyar peoples and districts; only in the Jugo-Slav territories has the dominant nationality enjoyed reasonable autonomy.

Now the question was: How much of all this will Hungary be allowed to retain? To the Magyar it seemed unthinkable that the coming peace would deprive Hungary of her historic frontiers, though it was generally realized that the Jugo-Slav lands were probably lost.

Soon after he came to power Karolyi made a journey to Belgrade to confer with General Franchet d'Esperey. When he had laid his requests before the general in the name of the Hungarian state, the Frenchman spoke up:

"You represent the Magyar people only, not the other nations of Hungary."

Karolyi understood. It was evident that the Allies were planning to divide up Hungary along national lines.

III.

The new regent soon discovered that he would have to reckon with a growing revolutionary movement that soon took on a form resembling Russian Bolshevism. The distress in the land was great; the country was encircled by hostile and greedy neighbors; there was anarchy and warfare on the frontiers; the situation was rapidly becoming unendurable.

Out of this confusion arose two new political parties, neither of which was entirely in sympathy with the government. First, a Communist party with a creed resembling somewhat that of Bolshevism was formed under the leadership of Bela Kun, who is said to have been at one time the secretary of Nicolai Lenine. Later a middle class party was organized in opposition to communism; but the bourgeois elements very soon discovered that they had little strength in the state.

Ostensibly, at least, Karolyi was opposed to communism. Early in the new year he asked the national council for powers to check the Bolshevik agitation. The Socialistic elements now took fright; evidently Hungary was to be merely another conventional middle class republic. The Socialist members of the cabinet resigned their portfolios and the government collapsed.

Once more Karolyi turned to the national council for assistance. On January 13 that body elected him president of the republic, and invested him with extensive authority. The government was now distinctly of a more "liberal" type. But this was not satisfactory to the Allies, who urged the formation of a coalition cabinet; nor was it satisfactory to the radi-

cals in Hungary. About the middle of February a communist revolt broke out, which had to be crushed with the aid of troops. From that day the Karolyi regime became daily more unpopular.

It may be true (as has been charged) that Karolyi was already plotting with Russians and Germans, but it is quite unlikely that he had become a convert to Bolshevism. But this much is evident: his government had failed and he doubtless realized his failure.

In March an act on the part of the Allies gave the Hungarian president the pretext that he seems to have needed. It had been determined to create a neutral zone in eastern Hungary, 140 miles long by 40 miles wide, connecting the territories inhabited by Poles on the north and by Roumanians on the south. This was to be administered by the Hungarian government under the direction of the Allies. It was no doubt hoped that in this way a continuous barrier would be created extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, which would separate Central Europe from Russia and confine Bolshevism to its home in the east.

The note advising the Hungarian government of this decision was dispatched on March 19; three days later President Karolyi resigned his office, and turned the administration over to the Communist leaders. In a manifesto to the Hungarian people he professed to see in this recent action of the Allies an indirect

effort to draw new boundaries. The statement closes with this defiant sentence:

"As the provisional president of the Hungarian people's republic I turn against the Paris Peace Conference to the proletariat of the world for justice and support."

Strange language for a Magyar aristocrat!

Certain American editors have shown some reluctance to take the communist professions of the new government seriously. Hungarian Bolshevism is merely a threat, they believe. But events are likely to show that these writers are misinterpreting the situation. Bela Kun, who is now the Hungarian foreign minister, is a confirmed Communist, and seems to be very influential in the new regime. The new government appears to be going ahead with an extensive program of socialization; large estates, banks, mines, and important industries are apparently in the process of being taken over by the state.

At the same time it is not necessary to argue that the majority of the Hungarians have become Bolshevik. In the general acquiescence in the new regime we should probably see the desperation of Magyar nationalism. It is probably the defiant stand of an aggressive people that is threatened with the loss of at least half of its territorial area and strength.

The Food Administration: A Test of American Democracy

BY EVERETT S. BROWN, PH.D., OF THE AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION, FORMERLY CHIEF OF THE PRESS CLIPPING SECTION, U. S. FOOD ADMINISTRATION.

War is a severe test of political institutions. Con-tempt for the efficiency of democratic forms of government in warfare was one of the principal causes of the overthrow of the German military autocracy. The German leaders underestimated the most potent force in all government—the overwhelming power of united public opinion. Public opinion is, of course, strongest in those forms of government wherein it is allowed freedom of development. A war supported by public opinion becomes at once a people's war, and success rests not on a single ruler or limited group of men, but on the combined efforts of the entire nation.

In a country as large as the United States, with such a diversity of interests and so heterogeneous a population, one of the primary essentials in the waging of the great war recently brought to a successful close was the arousing of public opinion; to make every citizen feel that it was his war, and that his individual effort, when combined with that of his fellow-citizens, could win the war. Judged from the standpoint of its part in bringing the war home to every person in the country, of arousing patriotic, self-sacrificing public opinion, the United States Food Administration easily ranks among the first of our war organizations. It tested and proved the soundness of American political institutions.

By the time the United States entered the war it was plainly evident that food was to be one of the deciding factors in the struggle. Profiting from the experience of the Allies, President Wilson immediately made plans to mobilize the food forces of the United States. On May 19, 1917, but a few days more than a month after the declaration of war, he issued a statement of the Administration's food control program. To the powers over the production, conservation and marketing of farm crops already existent in the Department of Agriculture, he outlined the need of congressional legislation to regulate the distribution and consumption of foods, their export, import, price, purchase, requisition, storage and the like.

Even earlier than this the President had decided upon the man to undertake the task of food administration. Fortunately for the President and the country—and, it might be added, for the Allies—an experienced man was available. This was Herbert Hoover, who for over two years had been at the head of the Commission for Relief in Belgium. Mr. Hoover was just the sort of American to arouse the war sentiment of the people. His career had been typically American. Born in Iowa, of Quaker parents, he early in life was left an orphan. Going west,

he supported himself while pursuing a course of study in the newly-founded Stanford University. He rose rapidly in the field of mining engineering and was well on the road to success and fortune when the war broke out. Thus far he had been practically unknown outside the mining profession, but his successful management of the relief work in Belgium and Northern France appealed strongly to the sympathies of the American people and made him a national figure.

Herbert Hoover was a firm believer in American democratic institutions. In his first public statement after being asked by President Wilson to undertake the new task of food administration, Mr. Hoover, on April 21, while still in London, expressed his faith in the American people in these words:

"I do not believe there will be any necessity to rigidly ration the American people, for, if democracy is of any value as a spiritual and political faith, the personal initiative and willingness to volunteer self-sacrifice of every member of the greatest democracy in the world will be ample to solve the problem."

How this faith was justified is now a matter of history—one of the most glorious pages in the history of our participation in the war.

It was expected that Congress would take early action to enact the legislation on food matters requested by the President. Unexpected obstruction in Congress, especially in the Senate, however, delayed the passage of the Food Control Bill for over three months. Had the President and Mr. Hoover done nothing until the bill had become a law the results to the Allies might have been disastrous. Even as it was, the delay proved a serious handicap in the race with the German submarines. Mr. Hoover, with a knowledge of the European food situation gained through personal experience, realized fully that there was no time to waste. He at once gathered around him a group of the most expert men in all branches of business relating to food. Since he regarded the contemplated Food Administration as being a purely temporary war organization, and dependent in large measure upon volunteer direction, Mr. Hoover did not consider it wise to set up a rigid form of departmentalism. He decided to treat the entire question of food control as one of a series of problems. As each new problem arose Mr. Hoover selected from his associates a man to handle it, and this man invited others to assist him. Where certain problems from their character required a more or less permanent staff, a permanent head was selected to devote his entire time to the subject. This plan allowed flexibility and, at the same time, proved very efficient.

While waiting for congressional action, Mr. Hoover prepared to enroll the American people in the task of saving food. As the nation's motto he suggested: "Eat Plenty, Wisely, Without Waste." The mobilization of the voluntary food-conservation forces was given presidential sanction by a letter from President Wilson to Mr. Hoover, dated June 17, in which the President stated that the work admitted of no delay. On the same day on which he received this letter from

the President, Mr. Hoover issued a request for every woman in the United States in control of a household to register with the Food Administration. To carry this plan into effect a registration drive was set for the days from July 1 to July 15, inclusive. Registration consisted in signing and mailing to the Food Administration a pledge to follow the direction and advice of the Food Administrator.

Congress as yet having given no legal sanction for the organization of food administration machinery, Mr. Hoover was obliged in the enrollment campaign to depend on the voluntary co-operation of organizations already in existence. Every possible agency for getting the food message to the people was employed. State Councils of National Defense, women's clubs, churches, fraternal orders, public libraries, schools, business houses and newspapers were utilized. Sunday, July 1, was designated Food Saving Day, and one hundred and forty-three thousand letters were sent to the ministers of the country asking them to make on that day a plea for food conservation. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company assisted by having each of the thousands of district managers of the company telephone to all of the ministers in his district asking whether they intended to observe Food Saving Day. Twenty-one thousand letters were sent to newspaper editors requesting their co-operation in impressing upon the public the necessity for individual effort toward food conservation.

It was but natural that the first appeal should be directed to the women, because ninety per cent. of the foodstuff used passed through their hands. Furthermore, as it was very aptly stated by the president of the Daughters of the American Revolution when appealing for support of the food saving program, "the men of the nation may make the laws, but it is the women who must create the sentiment that alone can secure practical food conservation." The response was most gratifying. Within a few days after the appeal was issued, more than two million pledges were on their way to Washington. The Home Card of the Food Administration, hanging in the kitchens of two million homes (later to be increased to over thirteen million), marked an important step in the awakening of public opinion. American womanhood was enlisting for the war.

After the home, the officials of the Food Administration recognized that the school was one of the most potent forces for the spread of public opinion. When the pledge campaign was started practically all of the schools had been closed for the summer vacation, but advantage was taken of the fact that a large percentage of the attendance at the summer schools of the various universities was composed of school teachers. The Food Administration edited a course of ten lessons on food conservation, especially designed for use in the summer schools. These lessons emphasized the world food shortage and the need of conservation, and informed the students how this food conservation might be accomplished. As a result, a large number of teachers returned to their schools with a clearer

idea of the meaning of the food problem. Appeals made by the teachers to their pupils were carried by the latter to their homes, and thus the gospel of food saving was disseminated.

Let it be kept well in mind that all that was accomplished by the American people in food saving prior to August 10, 1917, was done in response to an appeal for voluntary service; for not until August 10 did Congress pass the bill which gave the Food Administrator legal authority to force slackers into line. Yet despite the lack of legislation, Mr. Hoover, on July 28, was able to say:

"We entered the war four months ago, and it was announced by the President that one of the greatest problems of the war would be food; that we must prepare to increase and to save our foodstuffs for a year in advance, not only for ourselves, but for our Allies as well. There has been no consequential national or local legislation, yet the greatest spontaneous effort ever made in history has provided us with a larger stock of food supply as a result of patriotic planting in every quarter, and waste is being eliminated out of every crack and cranny of our homes and of our industries. This is being done without compulsion of the law, but by spontaneous effort and self-denial of the people. There have sprung up over night throughout the United States, in every city, county, village and state, definite and positive organizations, practical in their ends and unflagging in their efforts, which have the will to solve food supply questions. No autocratic government could accomplish this. Germany accomplished less in twelve months than our people have done in four. The only need of our legislation and authority is to curb those who would profit by this volunteer movement."

On August 10, after months of obstruction and delay in Congress, the Food Control Bill was passed and sent to the President for his signature. It is not necessary here to enter into a discussion of the debates in Congress on the bill. Suffice it to say that public opinion throughout the country, as expressed in the daily press, was strongly in favor of the speedy passage of the bill. After three months of debate the vote on the bill was rather illuminating; only five Representatives and six Senators voted in the negative.

Briefly, the Food Control Act gave the President authority to exercise control in certain ways over necessities of life, including food and fuel, employing such agencies as might be suitable, in the Government or among the people, already existing or newly devised for the purpose. Hoarding, profiteering, mischievous speculation, and all practices injurious to the public interest in war time were forbidden under severe penalty. The law applied to manufacturers, wholesalers, and others who handled commodities in bulk, and to large retailers. It did not extend to the consumer nor to the small retailer, nor to farmers or farmers' associations. Definite price-fixing power was granted in only one commodity, wheat, and the act specified that for the 1918 crop the price should not be less than two dollars a bushel.

Space will not permit, nor does the nature of this paper call for a detailed description of the administration of the Food Control Act; of the fixing of the price of wheat and of the handling of that commodity by governmental agency; of the regulation of sugar; of the stabilization of the price of hogs; and of numerous other questions, all interesting and important in themselves, and part of the history of the Food Administration. The discussion here will be limited to the means by which the great mass of American citizens was aroused to play its part in food saving, and to the results obtained.

No sooner had Congress passed the Food Control Bill than President Wilson signed it, and, by executive order, created the Food Administration with Mr. Hoover as its head. Hitherto that organization had existed by grace of the order of the President only. Mr. Hoover at once assured the business men of the country that his plan was not to interfere with their businesses, but to ask them to patriotically co-operate with the Government to meet the great national emergency. Following this he again made a direct appeal to the people to save food. As before, he expressed confidence that America would "render more for flag and freedom than king-ridden peoples surrender at compulsion."

It was not difficult to persuade the American people to save food; the greatest problem was that of fully acquainting them with the particular foods to be saved at different times and the best methods of accomplishing this. The organization adopted for this purpose is worthy of examination. So far as possible it relied upon existing local agencies. At the headquarters of the Food Administration in Washington was a States Administration Division which served as the connecting link between the States and the Washington office, and at the same time co-ordinated the work in the various States. In Washington, also, was an Educational Division, the duty of which was to keep the officials within the States informed on all matters of publicity. In this division were sections directing special fields of activity, such as home economics, libraries, retail stores and farm journals.

Food Administration activities within each State (and this included Alaska, Hawaii and Porto Rico) were under the supervision of a Federal Food Administrator, appointed by the President on nomination by Mr. Hoover, from among the prominent men of the state, and giving his time to the Government without compensation. All publicity material for the state was handled by an Educational Director, whose position in the state corresponded with that of the director of the Educational Division in Washington. To co-operate with the State Educational Director there were certain other officers. Under the guidance of a Library Director, who, in turn, received direction from the director in Washington, public libraries placed on exhibit Food Administration displays, distributed pamphlets and books on food conservation, and served as community centers for detailed information relative to the food problem. Similarly, a Mer-

chant Representative arranged with retail merchants to use window displays and booths to make a visual appeal for food conservation. A Director of Home Economics (always a woman) advised home economic teachers and others on the uses of substitutes in cooking, and in general assisting in technical matters connected with food.

The thoroughness with which the smaller units of government were organized differed in accordance with the ability of the state and county leaders. There was no fixed form of internal administration for all the states, but the plan of a typical state organization—as actually submitted to headquarters in Washington—was as follows:

The president of the largest bank in each county was asked to call together a representative of each bank of his city, the editors of the leading newspapers, and the chief executive of the commercial club, for the purpose of nominating for county food administrator the most active and aggressive man in the county, who would give his services without compensation and who would devote considerable time to the work. These nominees were appointed by the Federal Food Administrator of the state. A meeting of the county administrators was then called. Each one was asked to appoint a committee to assist him, this committee to include one person from each town in the county. All publications were distributed through these committees. The committees were also charged with the duty of investigating complaints regarding the violation of the food laws in their respective counties, and reporting to the Food Administrator for the state the cases which proved to be well founded.

Mr. Hoover's plan was to decentralize authority as much as possible; to have each local unit settle its own food problems without appeal to Washington. In other words, the Food Administration was to be a democratic organization with its base as broad as the local units of government of the county.

American advertising genius was called into play, and admonitions to save food greeted the eye at every turn. Food pledge weeks and intensive drives on public opinion kept alive the interest of the people in the subject. Wheatless days and meatless days were observed with patriotic zeal. Those who did not play their part were despised as slackers, and frequently suspected by their neighbors of being in league with the Germans. During the dark days of the Allies' greatest need, saving wheat assumed almost the seriousness of a sacred rite, so that Mr. Julius Barnes, president of the United States Food Administration Grain Corporation, could declare: "I say it earnestly, and in all reverence, that, with us, grain has ceased to be measured in terms of bushels, or barrels, or dollars, and it has been borne in upon us that it should be measured actually in terms of the lives of women and children abroad."

Such a spirit on the part of the American people was certain to get results. We entered the crop year of 1917-1918 with a wheat supply which allowed us only 20,000,000 bushels available for export. By

December 1, 1917, this surplus had been shipped, together with an additional 36,000,000 bushels taken from the stock reserved for home consumption. Then in January came a cable from the late Lord Rhondda, British Food Controller, stating that unless an additional 75,000,000 bushels could be sent he could not take the responsibility for assuring the British people that they would be fed. Mr. Hoover replied that he believed the American people would not fail to meet the emergency. Again his faith was justified. The American people responded by sending not 75,000,000 but 85,000,000 bushels, all saved from the home consumption between January 1 and the harvesting of the new 1918 crop. The severe winter of 1917-1918, together with the failure in large measure of the corn crop to mature properly, added to the difficulties to be overcome, and, correspondingly, to the glory achieved through the success of the wheat conservation drive.

The great voluntary saving campaign was helped to some extent, it must be admitted, by regulations. When the crisis was most acute it was thought advisable to issue regulations restricting the use of wheat flour. Accordingly, on January 28, 1918, the 50-50 rule was put into effect, requiring every purchaser of wheat flour at the same time to purchase a like amount of certain substitutes. On February 3, commercial bakers were required to mix five per cent. of other cereals with their wheat flour. This amount was gradually increased to twenty per cent. by February 24. In April, the wheat shortage became so acute that the bakers were compelled still further to increase the use of substitutes, the rules requiring twenty-five per cent. of non-wheat cereals by April 14. These baking regulations, as well as the 50-50 rule, remained in force until August 28, when the 50-50 rule was changed to 80-20, only one pound of substitutes being purchased with each four pounds of wheat flour. At the same time, bakers were allowed to make bread containing only twenty per cent. of wheat substitutes. Both of these rulings remained effective until November 14.

These regulations were successful in assisting to bring about a conservation of wheat, largely because of the strong public sentiment back of the Food Administration. When one remembers that nearly sixty per cent. of the baking of the country is done in the home, one realizes that it was the voluntary service of the American housewife which was the dominating factor in the conservation campaign. Towns, counties and entire states went on a wheatless diet for several months. It was an example of patriotism of a rare type—rare because pressure was so remote.

Similar results were obtained in meats and sugar. In the case of sugar, regulations limiting the amount which could be purchased had their effect, but credit must again be given to the patriotic conservation by the housewife, as seventy per cent. of the sugar consumed in the United States is used in the home. On a basis of normal consumption, it was estimated that during the four months of July, August, September and October, 1918, the saving in sugar amounted to

500,000 tons out of a total normal consumption of 1,600,000 tons.

The signing of the armistice brought military hostilities to a sudden close, but it did not free the American people from their pledge of food conservation. Only the purpose of the food saving campaign was changed—the change from a war basis to a world relief basis. Instead of a pre-war normal export of less than 6,000,000 tons of foodstuffs, and an export of 11,820,000 tons in 1918, the people of the United States are called upon to export 20,000,000 tons in 1919.

Yet the close of hostilities and the end of the year 1918 may be used as a convenient vantage point from which to contemplate results. Why, it was frequently asked during the war, was not a rationing system established in the United States. The answer is simple: it was not necessary. Leaving out of consideration the cost of the administrative machinery involved in such a system and the difficulties incident

to the fact that much of our food is raised and consumed at home, thus rendering enforcement of rationing practically impossible, it must never be forgotten that the war was a struggle between autocratic and democratic institutions. Rationing represented governmental control from the top downward. Under the voluntary system each individual performed his duty all the more willingly because he did so from choice and not from coercion. And yet behind the voluntary system was a coercive power stronger than the rule of any autocrat—the power of public opinion, the bulwark of American democracy.

In summing up the accomplishments of the United States in the war, Herbert Hoover rightfully said: "America by her participation in the war has accomplished her objectives of self-defense and of vindicating the efficiency of a government in which the people, and the people only, are sovereign." The Food Administration was one of the war organizations which justified this statement.

The Background of Germany's Hold on Russia

BY EUGENE NEWTON CURTIS, GOUCHER COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

As the European war developed, one fact stood out with increasing clearness. The purpose of the military and economic masters of Germany was to acquire control over the immense resources of Russia. Whatever dreams of permanent supremacy in Belgium and Northern France might have been cherished at the outset, were shattered by the advent of the American army. But her purpose to pilfer what she might from the shattered wreck of what was once the Russian Empire and to have a free hand in the reconstruction of its fragments, Germany did not surrender until the bitter end. By the annexation of the Baltic provinces, by the erection of small vassal states in Finland, Poland and the Ukraine, and by the conclusion of a drastic trade treaty with the poor remnant of a great state, she thought to exploit the wealth of Eastern Europe according to her pleasure. Samson, blinded, shorn and bound, was to grind corn for the Philistines. And this meant that Germany would dominate the world.

Despite the crumbling of the German Empire, it would be a fatal mistake to conclude that this menace has been forever averted. For the full measure of the peril is not obvious to those who do not know how deeply in the past this thing lies rooted. The average American, taking his history lightly, knows indeed that Russia bounds Germany on the east even as France bounds it on the west, but is unaware that the control of the central empire over the one neighbor has been essentially stronger than over the other. He views it as a problem of contiguity and of temporary military strength, whereas it is really the culmination of a millennium of effort on the part of a more advanced people to impose itself and its ways upon a relatively backward one. A clear grasp of this fact is a matter of first importance.

The earliest mention of Russians in a German document is significant by way of forecast. Certain individuals called Rhos were sent by the Greek Emperor Theophilus in 839 to the court of Lewis the Pious at Ingelheim on the Rhine, that they might be returned to their homes by a safer way than that over which they had come to Byzantium; believing them to be kindred of the Swedes, his enemies, Lewis, instead of sending them on their way, detained them to see if they might not be spies. We have no account of their ultimate fate. Somewhat more than a century later, in 961, Olga, Princess of Kiev, becoming converted to Christianity, requested the German Emperor Otto I to send her a bishop. Adalbert of Trier went to Russia for a year, but failed because he could not master the language nor stem the heathen reaction under Olga's son. The slender contact between Kiev, earliest seat of Russian civilization, and the Empire was maintained during Otto II's reign, then dropped. In the eleventh century, Russia and Germany met for the first time in the domain of *la haute politique*. The meeting took the significant form of an interference by Germany in Russia's internal affairs. A strife having arisen between the Russian princes, Jaroslav of Novgorod and Swatopluk of Kiev in 1017, Henry II made haste to join the former against Boleslav, king of Poland, who supported the latter; the German party was, however, completely defeated. From this time on, the connection between the two lands remained constant for several centuries. Marriage relations between the Russian and German courts in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were common. Trade relations between southern Russia and southern Germany find their earliest record in a manuscript written at Raffelstetten on the Danube in 904, regulating customs tolls on that river at the time of

Lewis the Child, and fixing the duties, which must be paid by Russian wax, slaves and horses. Kiev reached the height of its splendor in the next two centuries, when it became the entrepot for Oriental and Western goods, and when Adam of Bremen called it a rival of Constantinople. Here silks, brocade, linen, wine, oil, saddlery, spices, metal, weapons, gloves and many other articles were brought from East and West in exchange for Russian slaves, honey, wax, horses, furs, skins, leather, timber, pitch, flax, tallow, hops and sometimes grain. A great quantity of German, English, Danish, Bohemian, Byzantine and Arabic coins of this period has been found in Russia. Thus two permanent characteristics of Russian commerce appear from the very beginning: the export of raw materials in exchange for manufactured goods and a balance of exports over imports. Kiev traded chiefly with Breslau, Prague, Vienna, Enns and Augsburg, and after the twelfth century with Regensburg. It is interesting to recall that Kiev, where Germany gained her first foothold in Russia, is the capital of the Ukraine.

From the thirteenth century on, Kiev gradually declined. The rise of rich trade centers on the Danube and of the Italian cities furnished easier routes between East and West than that through Russia. The interposition of a powerful, hostile, Catholic Poland shut her off from contact with the West, and then fell the night of the Tartar invasion, in whose obscurity the Russian people groped for full two hundred years, so that when the cloud lifted she saw herself left far behind in the European race for civilization.

Northern Russia was not so intimately affected by these circumstances, and it is just during these two centuries, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth, that Novgorod, which succeeded to the primacy of Kiev, was in its prime. Contact between that remarkable city-state and the pushing German trader began as early as 1184, when German merchants who had formed a trading company at Wisby on the island of Gothland built a church and an exchange in Novgorod, hard by a Scandinavian exchange, established thirty-odd years before. When the Hanseatic League succeeded the earlier Gothland company, it took over the Novgorod factory among the other assets of its predecessor. Not many years elapsed before this precursor of the modern trust succeeded in squeezing out all competitors, and the German traders absorbed the Scandinavian exchange in addition to their own. The League is thought to have had other trading-posts in Russia, at Smolensk and at Pleskow on the Velika, perhaps even at Moscow, but the Novgorod factory remained the chief staple for Asiatic and Russian products. Here, as in other foreign towns, the Germans occupied a special quarter, wherein they built their church, their guildhall, warehouses, stores and dwellings. Within this semi-fortified enclosure, guarded at night by watchmen and dogs, the merchants enjoyed complete self-government by elected aldermen; it was like the foreign quarter in a Chinese city, and a Boxer rebellion against the "foreign devils" was possible at any time, for the Germans were not popu-

lar. Confident in the superiority of their Kultur, they forbade strictly all social intercourse with the natives; jealous of their monopoly, they refused to permit any private trading with them. They opposed the policy of the open door even more vigorously than was usual in the Middle Ages, when it never was very popular. Not only did they forbid the Lombards to enter their Novgorod precincts in 1346, and succeed in keeping them out of the Baltic cities in 1405, but they even tried to prevent non-Hanseatics from learning Russian. The League was notorious for this spirit of selfish exclusiveness; its refusal to permit English merchants to enjoy rights in German cities in any way equivalent to the privileges it was accorded in the London steelyard was one of the reasons for the loss of its power in that city. Nor were the Leaguers as interested in the freedom of the seas as their descendants purport to be to-day. Bent on making the Baltic a German lake (so far as the sturdy Scandinavians would permit) they actually forbade Russians to trade on that sea, and punished the crew of any Russian merchant ship they captured. History does not record whether or not they were "spurlös versenkt." The same offensive haughtiness appeared in their relations with the Novgorod Russians, presently leading to mutual accusations of trickery and dishonest trading. This in turn produced regulations discriminating against the Russians in favor of the Leaguers. If a native was bankrupt, a German merchant creditor had a right to prior payment over Russian creditors; the Germans might further insist that he and his family be banished from the city. The bad spirit between the two elements caused constant quarrels, and several times the League was obliged to withdraw from the city. Its tenure was so precarious that a League rule forbade any merchant to send or store at Novgorod, goods worth more than a thousand marks. However, the Russian trade was so rich that the League managed to retain its foothold until Ivan the Terrible in 1570 broke Novgorod's power, imprisoned the merchants for many years, and confiscated their merchandise.

Thus ended what might be called the second period of German influence, characterized like the first chiefly by economic intercourse, in which the superior organization of the Western trader gave him an undoubted advantage. With the accession of Michael, the first Romanov, in 1613, a third period begins, which has lasted, to a greater or less degree, up to the present day. Unlike the first two, the influence is now quite as much political as economic, and no longer confined to a single city, for, in the interim, Russia had become a nation. It is impossible within the limits of this article to do more than suggest some of the more striking aspects of this steady, quiet Teutonic pressure, for the full tale of it would mean a history of Russia. No one would maintain that it has been a definitely purposed campaign, functioning from any particular center. There are times, especially in the last few decades, when that has been true. But for the most part it has been the steady infiltration of ambitious individuals or groups of in-

dividuals, who have pushed themselves into places of power and from these points of vantage, have stamped their peculiarly Teutonic impress upon large areas of the life and thought of Russia. And here the chief matter has been their effect on the Russian royal family and the ruling caste.

The earliest use of German talent in this period was, appropriately enough, in the art of war. In 1631, German gunners were hired to work the new artillery and one year later, fifteen hundred German mercenaries under foreign colonels fought in a Russian expedition against Smolensk. Economic instruction came hard after, when in 1634 Moscow hired copper smelters from Saxony and Brunswick. Ten years later a Hamburg merchant was given a twenty-year concession to build factories. Soldiers, technicians, merchants, manufacturers began to come in ever-increasing numbers.

Already in the days of Ivan the Terrible, a colony of immigrants from Western Europe had sprung up on the River Yauza near Moscow, who lived in what was called the German quarter. In Michael's reign, these immigrants increased rapidly and began to settle all over the city. This soon bred trouble between Germans and Russians, resulting in a ukase of 1643 forbidding Germans to reside or build churches anywhere outside of their own quarter. The historian Kluchevsky tells the delightful story of the incident that provoked the ukase. Certain German officers had married into merchant families; on Sunday these ladies showed their sense of social superiority by trying to occupy seats in church in front of the merchants' wives, who resented the snobbery of their sisters so indignantly that a riot ensued. The Russian Patriarch happened to be passing, and in the interest of law and order, directed that the church where such a scandal was possible be pulled down that very day. So it is plain that the social prestige of the German military caste is not of yesterday. The new quarter became a well-built suburb, which soon had over a thousand inhabitants; in 1660 there were three Lutheran churches and one Reformed, beside a German school. It was not long before Michael and his boyars began to adopt the luxuries of Western life, which they saw here. Instead of rude carts, they rode abroad in ponderous upholstered coaches; their new stone houses were panelled in Belgian leather and adorned with pictures and German clocks. Little Alexis, Michael's son, was given German toys and play-horses, and had a wonderful suit of armor made for him by a German artisan, one Peter Schaldt. His tutor, a Germanophile, taught him by ocular instruction through the use of German engravings; he and his brothers were dressed in German costume. When he became Tsar he went a step beyond his father. The Lutheran pastor had trained a troupe of young Germans as an amateur theatrical company. Alexis, to the scandal of conservative Russians, built a theatre in his suburban residence in 1672, where the pastor produced "Esther," "Judith," "Joseph," and "Adam and Eve," German plays of a melodramatic sort, wherein realistic fighting and executions alter-

nated with rather coarse comedy. In the following year the pastor had twenty-six young Russians under him for instruction, which has suggested the observation that Moscow had a school of drama before it had any system of elementary education. The Russian ballet followed. In 1674, some German youths, proteges of the pastor, played "viols, organs and other instruments and did dance."

This royal pro-Germanism did not go without protest. Yuri Krizhanitch, a Serb who had made Russia his home, voiced the spirit of indignant nationalism. "No people under the sun," he wrote in 1670, "hath ever been so shamed and wronged by the foreigner as have we Slavs by the Germans. Nay, we are stifled beneath a multitude of aliens; they do fool us and lead us by the nose; they do sit upon our backs and ride us like cattle; they do call us swine and dogs, while thinking themselves equal to gods, and ourselves but simpletons. Upon that which is wrung of our tears and sweat, and of the forced fasting of the Russian people, do these foreigners—these Greek merchants and German merchants and officers and Crimean robbers—grow fat. And all this hath arisen of our fondness for the stranger. At everything which is strange we do marvel, and do praise and extol it, while despising everything in our life which is our own." He called upon Alexis to deliver his people and their race-brothers. "Thou alone, O Tsar, hast been given us of God to succour them who do dwell beyond the Danube, the Tsechs and the Lechs, to the end that they may perceive that they are oppressed of the stranger, and living in shame, and that they may begin to cast the German yoke from off their necks." But the protest went unheeded.

With Peter the Great, foreign influence became supreme in Russian policy. English, Dutch and French culture was laid under contribution, but the German element remained dominant. In his early days, Peter was accused by the regent Sophia of introducing German customs; he always liked to wear German clothes; idle gossip said that his father was a German surgeon. The Russian Academy of Sciences, which he founded with the aid of German and a few French scholars, has issued its publications in German until a recent date. The new administrative terminology, necessitated by Peter's reforms, was largely borrowed from his western neighbor. From that time until now the rank of Russian army officers has been designated by German titles, while *hofmeister*, *stallmeister*, *kammerjunker*, *kammerfrau* were naturalized in the usage of the Russian court. Even the new capital, symbol of all his dreams of a westernized Russia, was called St. Petersburg.

It was in the first half of the eighteenth century that the Romanov dynasty became Teutonized beyond repair. Peter married his son and nieces into German families, though he contented himself with a Livonian peasant, ex-servant in the household of Pastor Glück of Marienburg. When Anna, widow of the German Duke of Courland, came to the throne in 1730, the court became a facsimile of Berlin. Ernst Biren, her lover, was made chamberlain, Lewenwold

majordomo of the court, Ostermann had charge of foreign affairs, Korff and Kayserling were heads of embassies, Lascey, Münnich of Oldenburg, Bismarck and Gustav Biren, generals. In the corps of cadets for young nobles founded by Münnich, the history of Germany was taught to the exclusion of that of Russia. Some of these men, like Ostermann, were real statesmen, but many of them were mere adventurers, devouring the substance of Russia like a swarm of greedy locusts.

For a year after Anna's decade of Teutonic rule, the Germans kept their hold. But they quarrelled among themselves over the spoils. Biren, who had become Duke of Courland and grown fabulously rich, was driven from the regency by Prince Anton of Brunswick-Bevern, and his wife, Anna of Mecklenburg, with their respective favorites, Julia von Mengden and the Saxon Lynar. At last the outraged Russians rose against their oppressors, an anti-German reaction placed the Empress Elizabeth on the throne, and the land had rest from Teutonism for twenty years. When she came to die, however, she could do no better than appoint as her successor, Peter III, the son of Karl Friedrich Ulrich, Duke of Holstein-Gottorp, with whom the half-German dynasty of Oldenburg-Romanov or Holstein-Gottorp began that ruled Russia until 1917. Peter's fanatical admiration of Frederick the Great and its effect on the Seven Years' War are well-known as are his strutting before the mirror in his Prussian uniform and his declaration that he valued his Prussian army commission more than his imperial crown. Fortunately for Russia, it was only a matter of months before his queen, the German Princess Sophia of Anhalt-Zerbst, overthrew him, and, as Catherine II, inaugurated a new period of really national rule, bidding her doctor bleed her of the last drop of her German blood. Even Catherine, however, copied German methods in her governmental arrangements. She established the nobility as a class of privileged landowners along the lines of the Prussian Adel; she constituted assemblies on the model of the Landtag; the trades, corporations and municipalities were reconstructed according to the German system. To her rounding of agricultural colonies, reference will be made later.

Of the six Tsars who have ruled since Catherine, all but one have had German wives. Paul married Maria of Wurtemberg, Alexander I Louisa of Baden, Nicholas I Charlotte of Prussia, Alexander II Wilhelmine of Hesse-Darmstadt, and Nicholas III Alix of Hesse. Alexander III, whose queen was Danish, forms the only exception, and he was the most nationalistic of them all. In the policy of these emperors, with the doubtful exception of Alexander II, pro-Germanism and reaction have gone hand in hand. Paul, though an admirer of Napoleon, was so wedded to the Prussian army system that he introduced the uncomfortable Prussian uniform of the period, to the intense dislike of sturdy old Suvorof, his great general, who exclaimed: "Wig-powder is not gun-powder; curls are not cannon; a pigtail is not a sabre; I am not a Prussian, but a Russian born." Alexander I,

who was fond of Frederick William III and Queen Luise, saved Prussia from national extinction at Tilsit, even at the expense of Russian aggrandizement. His break with Napoleon was partly occasioned by his insistent support of the German Duke of Oldenburg, who had lost his throne through disobedience to French wishes. At the Congress of Vienna he upheld Prussia's claim to Saxony against England, Austria and France. Under the mystic inspiration of the Baltic German Mme. de Krüdener he founded that Holy Alliance, whose name became a symbol of reaction for an entire generation. The battle for control over his mind which the French-Swiss La Harpe lost to the Austrian Metternich was a stupendous defeat for European liberalism. Nicholas I, the bulwark of continental reaction in his day, attempted to organize Russia on rigidly disciplinary lines, modelling after Prussia. Count Nesselrode, his foreign minister, was a German by birth who had never learned Russian, which language was avoided in all communications of the Foreign Office, even verbal. It is said that during Nicholas' reign, no criticism of the German nation or of Prussian or Austrian policy was permitted in the press or in historical works; Germany must be referred to with praise as a bulwark of monarchical order. At his death in 1855, the *Berlin Kreuzzeitung*, organ of the Prussian Junkers, came out in deep mourning with the caption, "Our Emperor is dead." It was Bismarck's influence that turned the scale against any concession by Russia to Poland in 1863, though Alexander II was relatively liberal. Bismarck called it "a victory in the Russian cabinet of Prussia over Polish policy." Alexander II stood by Prussia faithfully in her three wars with Denmark, Austria and France, so that in 1870, Bismarck telegraphed him that after the Almighty, it was to him that Germany owed most of her success. From 1863 to 1878 the policy of the two governments was in complete accord. Sir Valentine Chirol, the English publicist, is authority for the statement that close personal relations have long existed between the Russian and German rulers in handling diplomatic questions, a special military plenipotentiary, accredited to the person of the sovereign, serving as the medium for confidential communications. Alexander III was anti-German, though even in his reign the Dreikaiserbund had a brief career. No reference to Nicholas II is necessary, the "Willy-Nicky" correspondence, Sturmer and the "dark forces" are fresh in the memory of us all.

A ruling house so thoroughly Teutonized in blood and sympathy for more than two full centuries, and to a somewhat less degree throughout its whole historic career, could not fail to stamp the spirit of Prussian autocracy deeply upon the people over whom it ruled. Backed with the tremendous religious authority that the Great White Tsar has always exercised over the simple moujik imagination, Prussianism has found in him an effective instrument of absolutism that the purely drill-sergeant conception of Berlin royalty could only meagerly afford. But the Ger-

man conquest went further yet. It swept not only over the ruling house, but over the ruling caste as well. Wesselitsky tells us that in Anna's reign, a considerable part of the nobility, intelligenzia and upper middle class in Petersburg had German blood, and that up to the revolution, German influence still permeated the whole administration, as well as most of the great industrial and financial companies. Alexinsky quotes statistics published by M. N. Rubakin, in a Moscow review in 1907, showing that in 1902 one hundred and forty-four Russian generals were German in blood and Protestant in religion, while in 1905 the number had become one hundred and eighty, besides one hundred and fifty-seven more of Orthodox faith. The social and political result of this strong strain of German blood in the Russian aristocracy is evident from the mere names of notorious Russian instruments of reaction. To go back only a hundred years, it was Colonel Schwarz, whose brutal flogging of certain officers in 1820 caused the regimental mutiny that led five years later to the revolt of the liberal Decembrists; it was the Baltic German Baron Tol who advised firing on them with artillery, and it was Prince Eugene, of Wurtemberg, as a Russian general, who crushed the uprising. General Benckendorff (later Count), the trusted counsellor of Nicholas I, was placed by him in 1826 at the head of the secret police. Kornilov, in his great "Modern Russian History," gives us some interesting extracts from a memorandum which Benckendorff laid before the Tsar, that illustrate his conception of his functions. "Criminals, intriguers and simple persons, having repented of their sins, and being desirous of redeeming their guilt by giving information, will at least know where to turn. . . . Rank, decorations, crosses serve as higher rewards than money for an officer, but for secret agents they are of no importance. . . . The Chief will have to travel every year, to visit the big fairs, where he could contract connections and attract persons avariciously inclined. His shrewdness should warn him against trusting even the director of his office; not even he must know all his assistants and agents. . . ." Counts Adlerberg and Kleinmichel were two other notorious reactionaries of Nicholas' time. General Todleben, a Baltic German, the defender of Sebastopol, was also the cruel repressor of an uprising at Odessa. Even under Alexander III, Count Pahlen, another Baltic German, became Minister of Justice, his appointment being intended, Alexinsky quotes a contemporary as saying, "as a corrective of the exercise of Liberalism occasioned by the new judicial institutions."

General Grünwald, the Tsar's aide-de-camp, opposed military reforms. Von Plehve, who instigated the Kishinev massacre, and Stürmer, the late premier of unpleasant memory, are merely two of the most conspicuous Teutonic reactionaries during the last Tsar's reign, nor did General Rennenkampf at the Masurian Lakes render his country services of very conspicuous worth.

If Russian Germans have been reactionary, Rus-

sian reactionaries have been pro-German. The deputy of the extreme Right mentioned by Kornilov, who during the discussion of a liberal project introduced into the Duma by the Cadets some years before the war, said menacingly, "If you accept this project, William will come and teach you a lesson with his armed fist," and the reactionary Prince Meschersky, who wrote in 1912 that "close friendship between Russia and Germany is a more advantageous and lasting blessing for France than dependence on ever capricious, ever selfish and ever insincere England," are merely typical.

Even the intellectuals have at times been hypnotized. Alexinsky quotes the words of the famous radical agitator Bielinsky, who, in his youth, passed through a pseudo-Hegelian phase that produced a sort of desperate fatalism, accepting the reactionary rule of Nicholas I on the basis that whatever is, is right. "Down with politics! Long live science!" he wrote in 1837. "Germany is the Jerusalem of modern humanity. . . . To youthful and virgin Russia, Germany must transmit her family life, her social virtues and her philosophy, which embraces the universe. . . . Might is right, and right is might. No, I cannot describe to you the feeling with which I heard these words—it was a liberation. I understood the fall of kingdoms, the legality of the actions of conquerors; I understood that there was no barbarous material force, no domination by the sword and the bayonet, that there was no such thing as despotism. . . . The word reality has for me become synonymous with the word *God*." Even the later anarchist Bakunin fell under the spell. He held at one time that real education is that which "makes a true and powerful Russian man devoted to the Tsar," and that Russia, abandoning French "babbling," must ally itself with "the German world with its disciplined conscience" and "with our beautiful Russian reality." Fortunately these men outgrew this apotheosis of Faustrecht; Bielinsky later cursed his "abominable leaning toward reconciliation with the abominable reality," and felt that Germany was "a shameful State." But the great reactionaries in official circles never outgrew it. The point of view was too consonant with their material interests.

With so influential a section of Russian society thoroughly Prussianized, the wonder is that the great mass of the nation retained a spirit more democratic than almost any nation in Europe. It is not the autocracy that surprises, but the revolution.

The forces thus far described have been in a measure spontaneous, the natural result of a long-continued penetration of Russian ruling circles by German blood and German ideas. The danger to Russian liberty and world-peace might seem already removed by the revolution which has overthrown the political power of the class chiefly affected. But unfortunately an even more sinister menace exists, in the shape of certain influences consciously directed by the German Government. These influences are of two sorts, economic control of Russian markets and the

fostering of German sympathy in certain large areas of the late Russian empire.

Russia, in spite of her industrial growth in the last half-century, remains an agricultural country. Her chief exports are cereals, eggs, timber and flax, her chief imports, machinery and textiles. It was, therefore, a terrible blow to her when in 1902 the German government, acceding to the demands of the Prussian agrarian Junkers (in politics the militarist conservatives), practically doubled the import duties on agricultural products. Professor Brentano, of Munich, gives the figures. Wheat, which, according to the previous tariff of 1891, carried a rate of three and a half marks per hundred kilos, was raised to five and a half on the minimum tariff scale and seven and a half on the maximum; rye, from three and a half to five and seven, respectively; oats, from two and four-fifths to five and seven; barley, from two to four and seven. The trade treaty negotiated with Russia in 1904 (a revision of the old 1894 agreement) permitted the application of the minimum rates, it is true, but it will be seen that even these were greatly in excess of the previous duty. Nevertheless, while Germany in 1912, according to Brentano, imported no rye and only three per cent. of her oats, eighty-seven per cent. of her wheat requirement and seventy-two per cent. of her barley came from abroad (principally from Russia). Furthermore, the *Statesman's Year Book* shows that in 1913, Russia's cereal exports to Germany amounted to 226,000,000 pounds (the pound being forty pounds), while Great Britain, the next best customer, took only 57,000,000. It is plain that Russia would seek more favorable markets (such as free-trade England) if geography and other factors permitted; that she has not done so, is sufficient evidence that she is economically at Germany's mercy and Germany drives hard bargains.

A more complete picture of the situation is afforded by the startling fact that while in 1901 Russian exports to Germany amounted to 178,000,000 roubles and to the United Kingdom 156,000,000, in 1913 the respective figures were 452,000,000, as against 267,000,000. In spite of all obstacles, Russian exports to Germany, which in 1901 formed roughly a fourth of her total exports, in 1913 made up a third.

In the matter of imports, Russia is in even worse bondage to her neighbor. The *Russian Year Book* for 1913 shows that in 1911 (the last year quoted) seventy-seven per cent. of her cotton goods consumption, seventy-six of woollen, seventy-three of silks, ninety-four of knitted goods, seventy-four of non-agricultural machinery, thirty-three of agricultural machinery, seventy-two of iron and steel goods, eighty-five of copper, seventy-seven of wire manufactures, eighty-three of scientific apparatus, and so on through a long list were "made in Germany." The total imports from Germany, amounting in 1901 to 208,000,000 roubles, and from the United Kingdom, the next competitor, to 102,000,000, had risen by 1913 to 642,000,000, in the former case, and 170,000,000, in the latter (the figures being taken again from

the 1904 and 1917 issues of the *Statesman's Year Book*). A little over half of all Russian imports came from Germany in 1913. By her system of cartels and export bounties, whereby she is able to overcome the high Russian duty on manufactured articles, and even to sell abroad more cheaply than at home, by the adaptability of her merchants to foreign needs and her great network of Russian-speaking commercial travelers, Germany achieved this noteworthy conquest. Drage tells us that in the last fifty years of the nineteenth century, Russian trade with Germany increased eleven and a half times, with the United States six and a half times, with Austria, Sweden and Norway five and a half times, with Holland five times, with Italy four times, with France three times, with England and China two and a half times, and with Turkey one and a half times. And his book, published in 1904, does not take in the enormous subsequent increase, Russo-German exchanges having grown two and a half times over what they were then. Truly, the monopoly of the Hanseatic League seems to be coming to life again.

This conquest of the Russian market has been accompanied and partially facilitated by a conquest of the sympathy of certain sections of the late Russian empire, partly through active colonization, partly through clever use of separatist movements. At the end of the last century, there were in Russia 158,000 German subjects and 121,500 Austro-Hungarian; the Turkish population was almost as great, a long way after which came the Persian with 74,000; there were 9,500 French and 7,500 English. But this is far from the whole story. There were in addition from 1,500,000 to 1,800,000 Russian subjects whose mother-tongue was German, no inconsiderable nucleus for pro-German propaganda. These latter are, however, more or less concentrated in certain well-defined areas. Catherine II really began the movement on a large scale by issuing invitations in 1762 and 1763 to foreign peasants to settle in Russia, offering each family seventy-five acres of free land, self-government, freedom from taxation for thirty years, and other privileges. Many thousands came, chiefly from southern Germany, settling in southeastern Russia on the lower Volga. The movement continued through the first part of the nineteenth century. The original colonies along the lower Volga sent off daughter settlements into central and southern Russia. In 1904 there were four hundred thousand Germans along the Volga alone. These colonists rarely intermarry with the Russians; their birth-rate, almost purely Teutonic, is considerably greater than that of the natives. They live by themselves, and a large proportion of them cannot speak Russian. Many of the young men perform their military service in the German army, and despite their long residence in Russia, the colonies may still be regarded as outposts of German Kultur.

A different situation obtains in the Baltic provinces, whose population never was and is not German to-day. Conquered by the Livonian and Teutonic

Orders in the thirteenth century, they remained under German sway for three hundred years, then passed into the hands of Poland and Sweden, to be finally won by Russia, Livonia and Esthonia by Peter the Great in 1710, Courland by Catherine II in 1795. To-day the native race, which is of Finnish, i.e., Asiatic origin, constitutes eighty-seven per cent. of the population in Esthonia and Livonia, seventy-nine per cent. in Courland, while the German element is a scant eight per cent. in Esthonia, and ten per cent. in the other two provinces. From early times, however, the German minority has formed the dominant class, both in the nobility and among the bourgeoisie, the natives being almost exclusively peasants. Three-fourths of the land is owned by this upper ten per cent. of the population. The spiritual bond between the upper class and their German cousins is strong. Their language and customs remain German, their young men are educated in Germany. At the University of Munich in 1914, I met the son of an Esthonian noble, von M——, who had spent one semester at Petrograd and six at various German universities. There was nothing to distinguish him in speech or manner from any well-bred young German. Yet in answer to my question, he disclaimed any analogy between the Alsace-Lorraine question and the situation in the Baltic provinces, which had belonged to Russia for two full centuries, and in his view did not seek a change. During the war, this attitude was, no doubt, not wholly maintained. While we lack exact information, it seems to be the case that there was a division of sentiment, a certain portion of the Germanic element favoring annexation by Germany, while another portion opposed it. Whatever the feeling may be in this ten per cent. of the population, annexation would have been an outrageous violation of majority rights. For nothing is more certain than that the Esths and Letts would bitterly resent such an issue. In 1816, Alexander I abolished serfdom in Esthonia (1817 in Courland, 1819 in Livonia) at the request of the local landowners, who resented the law of 1804-5, restricting their power over the peasants' holdings. This emancipation was, however, purely personal, leaving the lords owners of all land. The result was to make the peasants economic slaves of the landlords, as they are to this day. The agrarian disorders of 1905 were most conspicuous in the Baltic provinces, where the peasants burned and pillaged the estates of their oppressors, and cruel were the atrocities which accompanied their repression. Had Germany succeeded in annexing these provinces, the result would have been to perpetuate forever the economic mastery of this handful of Baltic Junkers, notoriously the most reactionary element in Russian public life. And besides this, it would have shut Russia's window to the west, and completed Germany's trade monopoly. Henceforth practically all goods from the west must needs come through German hands.

The south Russian agricultural colonies and the feudal baronage of the Baltic provinces might be called Germany's historic strongholds in Russia. There have been other more recent and more con-

sciously directed schemes of colonization. M. Weselitsky, who for fifteen years has been president of the Foreign Press Association in London, says that in January, 1910, he called the attention of Prime Minister Stolypin to Germany's constant sending of farmers and laborers into the Baltic provinces. He replied that he recognized the gravity of this situation, but that a much greater peril lay in the systematic German invasion of the southwest provinces. This movement was forecast by an article entitled, "Grossdeutschland," in the German *Zukunft* for September, 1905, which called for the systematic purchase by German syndicates of large Russian estates, as well as of the peasants' lands. The syndicates were to resell "to skilful and intelligent German farmers, who would scientifically cultivate them with cheap Russian labor." German tradesmen would settle in the small towns, making them centers of German culture. Manufacturers would follow, utilizing cheap Russian labor to build up great factories. In this way, "the vast territory the Russians are unable to cultivate themselves would receive its full value, and the regenerated Russia would form an appendage to the Central European agglomeration of states directed by Germany. The latter would discover the reward for her work of implanting culture in Russia by finding in it an immense field for the activity of the surplus of her population, which would not be lost for the Fatherland as when it emigrates to America." Only to make the plan a success "the German landlords must be much less harsh and imperious than were the German barons of the Baltic provinces." Five years later this scheme was in process of realization. Stolypin introduced a bill into the Duma, dealing with the matter, but it slumbered until 1913, when it was withdrawn by his successor. Not until the war was a law passed prohibiting the selling of land to Germans. It should not be forgotten that the menace of this colonization is distinctly political. Ever since the Reichstag in 1913 passed the law of "the double subjection," permitting all descendants of former German subjects to recover their nationality by private declaration to German consuls, the Jesuitical possibilities of the situation are infinite.

In a somewhat different way, Poland has been industrially colonized to some extent. The high Russian tariff against manufactured articles caused German competitors to build their factories across the Polish border. Now the great industrial city of Lodz has come to be half German in population, and its competition with Russian enterprises has grown so keen that some years ago, Russian manufacturers despairingly suggested a customs barrier between Poland and Russia or even cession to Germany of the part she had economically conquered. Even in purely Polish factories, and in many Russian ones, for the matter of that, most of the directing posts are filled by Germans, as Drage wrote nearly fifteen years ago.

The situation in regard to separatist movements is too obscure at present to discuss intelligently. In some cases Germany undoubtedly takes advantage of existing national sympathies. In a pamphlet pub-

lished by an English committee in London, February, 1914, entitled, "A Memorandum on the Ukrainian Question," the writer, Y. Fedortchouk, shows his fellow-countrymen to be bitter against Great Russia and the Galician Poles, somewhat irritated at Austria for her favoritism toward the latter, but friendly to Germany, because Ruthenian peasants (who are of Ukrainian stock), crossing the border for farm employment, received better pay and treatment there than from their Polish landlords. To what extent the recent German colonization of southwestern Russia, referred to above, has influenced the Ukrainian situation is an interesting matter for speculation.

Elsewhere the economic relationship has probably been decisive. Germany's grip on Poland has been indicated; the year before the war, Finland imported ten dollars' worth of goods from Germany for every seven she took from Russia, the mother country at her very door. Is it unreasonable that a cautious bourgeoisie should prefer a commercial connection so firmly established, to Bolshevik radicalism which profits them nothing now, and is at best uncertain for the future? Germany, which gained so effective a control over the Russian market in general, must have established herself even more strongly in those districts which are nearest her own territories. The present pro-Ally attitude of distant Finland affords no secure guarantee that she will not continue under the economic influence of a resurrected Germany.

The Brest-Litovsk treaty cost Russia an area containing thirty per cent. of her total population, a third of her railway mileage, seventy-three per cent. of her iron and eighty-nine per cent. of her coal resources, besides two hundred and sixty-eight sugar refineries, nine hundred and eighteen textile factories, six hundred and fifteen paper mills, two hundred and forty-four chemical works and one thousand and seventy-three machine shops. By the operation of the treaty, these passed, directly or indirectly, under German control. Had that treaty endured, the real triumph of *Deutschtum* would have been complete, whatever the issue of the war elsewhere. Even now the wrestling of these enterprises from private German interests will be no simple matter.

But the impatient reader may well exclaim, Is not this the story of an unhappy nightmare from which the world has at last awakened? Surely the defeat of Germany has ended her colossal dream of world-leadership forevermore. Let us not be too certain of that. Already signs are not lacking of a revived imperial consciousness in our vanquished foe. Prussia may not be divided, after all, we are told. The reorganized German army, aided by the old familiar brand of German diplomacy, does its best to restrict new Poland within narrow bounds. The Junkers failed to carry the National Assembly, it is true, but the Majority Socialists, who will dominate it, are even more interested in a strongly centralized control of economic resources. For the moment Germany is weak, but great states recover from defeat with astonishing rapidity; witness the revival of France after 1871. We are dealing here with age-long economic

and psychological processes, based on the contiguity of an advanced and a primitive people. We have described the course of a whole millennium of steady Teutonic conquest over the Eastern Slavs. This persistent infiltration of ideas and influences cannot be lightly set aside. By all present indications, Germany will recover her unity of purpose and will reorganize her national life far sooner than poor, tempest-tossed Russia. And then the invasion will begin again. Who shall say that a socialized Russia will not turn with instinctive sympathy to a socialized Germany for leadership, even as an autocratic Russia listened to an autocratic Germany? Thus far, she has shown little love for Germany's foes. A closely united Eastern and Central Europe, with strong radical tendencies, would be a truly formidable menace to the peace of society.

How, then, may we permanently undermine the foundations of Teutonic power in Russia? First, let us extend such economic aid to the impoverished population, that they may turn to us with renewed confidence in our friendly purposes. Let them feel that we come, not to restore a hateful regime, but to provide them with the necessities of life. So much is indispensable, if we would win back their faith in the rightness of our motives. From that basis of common understanding, we may proceed to a more fundamental effort to detach Russia from her ancient dependence. For that purpose, at least two modes of attack seem clearly indicated: a far-reaching campaign of education among the Russian people (three-fourths of whom are ignorant of their own history), and such permanent adjustment of tariffs and transportation facilities, combined with earnest study of the Russian market, as shall be necessary to permit equal competition for Russian trade. For unless Russia can be freed from economic bondage, her political independence must remain illusory.

MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION.

The annual spring meeting of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland will be held at the State Normal School, Trenton, N. J., on Friday and Saturday, May 9 and 10. A dinner meeting will be held on Friday evening at six o'clock, at which Professor J. S. Bassett, of Smith College, will speak upon "The History Teacher and the League of Nations." The address will be followed by a discussion of the best way of handling such materials in the class-room. The Saturday morning meeting will be devoted to a conference upon the reorganization of history and civics teaching. At least three members of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship will be present, and will direct the discussion; these members are Professor W. C. Bagley, Superintendent J. A. C. Chandler and Dr. Daniel C. Knowlton. Others who are expected to take part in the discussion are Professor Henry Johnson, Professor Edgar Dawson and Professor A. D. Risley.

The business session and election of officers will follow the morning meeting.

The Study of English History as an Influence in Promoting a Closer Anglo-American Entente

BY PROFESSOR ARTHUR LYON CROSS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

The field in which the very roots of American institutions are embedded should be an indispensable study for every future American citizen. As a subject for study in the secondary schools, English history has many manifest advantages as well as pressing claims. This vast and hospitable country is peopled by descendants of the most diverse races and nations, but the tradition of government is, in the main, an English tradition based on primitive Germanic ideas, modified and supplemented to meet the needs of a growing progressive civilization. Bearing this in mind, it would be well to recall briefly the features of English institutional progress which call for emphasis as the common heritage of English-speaking peoples. They should enter into the training of American citizens in order to make clear the principles for which we and the Allies have been and are contending—the principles which may be the foundation of a future brotherhood of nations.

While the Angles, Jutes, and Saxons brought to Britain strong notions of individual freedom, and local self-government, they lacked the capacity for central organization which is an essential factor in laying the foundation of well-ordered national liberty. This was brought from Normandy by William the Conqueror, and incorporated into the English system by him and his sons. His great grandson, Henry II, introduced that wonderful common law which, even to-day, forms the basis of the legal system of the British Empire, and of the United States as well; likewise he brought into general use the jury, a development of the administrative procedure of Charlemagne and his successors. Curiously enough, these free institutions were the gifts of half-foreign despotic kings, who ruled with an iron hand, while continental states, where absolutism afterwards found a more persistent abode, were still weak and divided, with most of the properly royal functions exercised by aspiring feudal lords. Unrestricted prerogative, however, did not survive in England more than a generation after the passing of Henry II. During the reign of his youngest son, John, came a constitutional crisis which bore enduring fruit. Magna Charta, to be sure, was the work of a body of barons primarily aiming to preserve feudal privileges, but it had the notable result of limiting the powers of the crown, and came, in consequence of centuries of interpretation, to be regarded as the cornerstone of English popular liberty. Among other things, it raised a problem which governments are still striving to solve—how to combine centralized efficiency with a proper regard for individual liberty. Under a wise, strong monarch, Magna Charta might have become a dead letter. Fortunately for the cause of progress Henry III proved

weak and addicted to foreign favorites, which kept the baronial opposition alive, with two significant results: Magna Charta was so frequently confirmed that its provisions, much extended from their original purpose, became securely rooted in the English constitution, and a representative assembly was created, which, in the course of time, replaced the barons as the custodian of national interests distinct from those of the crown. In this respect it developed in marked contrast to the estates general of the Continent. It should be remembered, in passing, that by a strange paradox Simon de Montfort, the leader in the national anti-monarchical struggle against Henry III, and one of the master builders, if not the founder, of parliament, was a French adventurer whom circumstances made an English patriot.

The attempt to substitute a baronial oligarchy for a royal despotism failed; but the precedent for a constitutional monarchy was established in the fateful thirteenth century. Edward I recognized many of the restrictions which had been imposed upon the royal power, and, preserving and perfecting what was best in the contributions of Henry II, laid the ground plan of the English constitution as it exists to-day. Some gains were made during the fourteenth century, but the tyranny and self-seeking of Edward's successors provoked another crisis which came to a head under the weak and capricious Richard II. The "constitutional experiment" of the Lancastrians which followed proved premature. Yet it provided further valuable precedents for the future. Three centuries later the Puritan Revolution established the principle—more than a hundred years before the French Revolution—that in cases of conflict between the crown and parliament, the representative body should prevail. This result was achieved in England at a time when royal despotism was reaching its height in other European countries. England's achievement, however, set an example which was widely followed in the European world when conditions became ripe for action. The ideas propounded in the debates in the Army Council, in Cromwell's time, formulated and developed by Hobbes and Locke, exercised a profound influence on the speculations of the philosophers who furnished the intellectual stimulus for the French Revolution.

At the Restoration the majority of the Englishmen turned their backs on the work of the Puritan extremists; but the restored monarchy was never again an absolutism in the old sense and the Church of England never recovered its all-embracing sway. Moreover, the rash attempts of James II to bring about an ecclesiastico-political reaction resulted in a new revolution, which, though bloodless, preserved so

effectually the fruits of the earlier conflicts that there has never since been civil war on English soil. In order most effectively to exercise the parliamentary supremacy which had been secured, the system of cabinet and party government was devised, a system which has been taken as a model by several European states during the past century. The growth of the English party system has had an important bearing on Anglo-American relations. Many of the English Whigs were staunch supporters of the cause of the Colonies in their revolt from the mother country. During the American Civil War, while the English Tories and the leaders of both English parties were coldly neutral or strongly in sympathy with the South, the great mass of the manufacturing classes in the midlands, in spite of great sacrifice on their part, stood firmly by the North and the cause of the Union. Since the second Reform Bill, in 1867, which extended the vote to the artisan classes in the towns, England, except for a few inevitable points of friction adjusted by arbitration, has been extremely well disposed toward the United States, and at the time of the Spanish-American War was our chief European friend. It should be borne in mind, too, that our Monroe Doctrine owes much to Canning's support, and that the liberal leaders, Palmerston and Russell, if not always by the most gracious methods, were ever valiant supporters of national liberty and unity in European affairs.

In consequence of the American Revolution—in which we owed so much to France, of the Industrial Revolution, and the economic teachings of Adam Smith, England was the first European country to give up the notion that colonies existed primarily for purposes of exploitation. As a result of Lord Durham's sagacious and epoch-making report, occasioned by the Canadian Rebellion, self-government has been, since the middle of the nineteenth century, introduced into every colony where conditions were ripe for it. Scarcely had the Boer War closed when self-government was restored in the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal. Much has been made of India and Egypt; but England only reluctantly extended her dominion in India; she refused in 1844, in 1853, and again in 1878 to take possession of Egypt. Occupation was forced on her in 1882, and a formal protectorate was first declared in December, 1914. In both countries natives share in the government and administration, and recently an imperial cabinet has met which contained Indian representatives. Although discontent and a desire for Home Rule exists among a certain group both in India and Egypt, the best commentary on British colonial administration is the loyalty with which her subjects beyond the seas have responded at crises, notably in the recent war. Ireland is still unsatisfied, and granted that she has been oppressed and exploited in the past, sincere efforts have been made during the past half century to better her political and economic position. The difficulties of establishing a working system of government have been great, while the attitude of the Protestant industrial classes in Ulster has added a most serious

complication. An Irish convention failed last year to reach a solution and Sinn Féinism is now rampant; but the prospect of an adjustment is by no means hopeless.

Such are some of the political features of English history of intimate interest to Americans. In the non-political field English achievement has been equally noteworthy. The Industrial Revolution, in many respects more far-reaching in its results than the French Revolution, took its rise in England. In humanitarian and religious reforms one can point to the names of Wycliffe, John Knox, the Wesleys, John Howard, William Wilberforce, Robert Raikes, the promoter of Sunday Schools, Elizabeth Fry, Thomas Fowell Buxton, Sir George Williams, the founder of the Young Men's Christian Association, and Florence Nightingale. In literature, Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton are world figures, while the romantic movement owes much to England, and the novel is an English product. In painting, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Turner, and Constable have exercised a world-wide influence; while Hobbes, Locke, Hume, and Berkeley have made enduring contributions to speculative thought. Scientific progress owes incalculable debts to Harvey, Newton, Cavendish, Dalton, Davy, Jenner, Simpson, Lister, Faraday, Kelvin, Darwin, Huxley, and Tyndall.

In thus emphasizing England's achievements there should be no thought of belittling those of other countries and other peoples, but enough can be said to show that England has given a remarkable account of her stewardship during the long centuries of her national existence. Americans have shared in much of her heritage; they should know the long and fascinating history of American institutions from their origin in English soil, in order to co-operate the more intelligently and devotedly with their kindred English-speaking peoples of the British Empire to establish a new reign of peace and justice throughout the earth. If a League of Nations is to be formed they have, in their common birthright, much that should prevail. Whether or not such a League is to be fashioned in the immediate future there is—as Professor George B. Adams has indicated recently in a most suggestive paper entitled, "The British Empire and a League of Peace"—a possibility of bringing our country and the British Commonwealth of Nations into a closer working agreement. Ever since the first Colonial Conference at Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1887 it has become more and more evident that the self-governing colonies—Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa—while controlling their own destinies in all but foreign affairs, even to the extent of regulating tariffs and immigration, are to have an increasing share in the determination of matters of common imperial concern. The idea of a federal parliament seems to have been thrown into the discard, for the reason that such an institution would hamper the several dominions in the maintenance of cherished policies, but the Imperial War Conferences of 1917 and 1918 have pointed the way to a more practicable adjustment. The premiers

and other representatives have held meetings for the discussion of common concerns, discussions which promise to be rich in future results. The Imperial War Cabinets which were held during the same period—sitting in secret and acting as a veritable executive—while admirably adapted for quick and effective action in the face of an unparalleled crisis, would doubtless prove unacceptable as a permanent organization in time of peace; because the dominion parliaments are bound to insist upon a greater responsibility from their ministers than would be possible under such a system. Even if some form of federal cabinet can be devised there is still a place for the periodic conferences, in which the United States might very well participate.

Whatever machinery may be constructed, it is to be hoped that the English-speaking peoples can be brought together in a closer organic unity. Hitherto, the instruction of our youth has not contributed most effectually to this end. In their American history, though of late the problems have been envisaged from a broader standpoint, they have been taught not a little about points of difference with England; more-

over, for the last two decades, there has been a growing tendency to drop the study of English history in the secondary schools. If European history continues to be preferred it is highly desirable that more attention should be paid, henceforth, to the English aspect of the subject. However, there is an alternative that has much to recommend it in the majority of cases where there is not room in the curriculum for the four subjects of ancient, English, European, and American history; a fusion of English and European history might be adopted, with the main emphasis on the development of English institutions, but with greater attention than was customary in the old-fashioned English history course, to the great continental movements and problems, all of which affected England and were affected by her in turn. Thus the future American citizen would be enabled to understand the common foundation on which the Anglo-American institutional edifice rests, to take a sympathetic share in the continuance of its building in years to come, and, at the same time, to have the perspective to appreciate what is worthy of perpetuation in the aims and institutions of other lands and peoples.

Class Methods in History Teaching

History Recitation Socialized

BY RANSOM A. MACKIE, M.A., SEATTLE,
WASHINGTON.

I. *The Aims of the Plan.*¹

1. To do away with passivity in the class-room.
2. To stimulate initiative and originality.
3. To correct wrong impressions.
4. To train the pupil in expression.
5. To enlarge the pupil's experience.
6. To enable the pupil to overcome individual weaknesses.
7. To enable the pupil to form the habit of concentrated effort and attention.
8. To build up, in an orderly, logical way, a definite store of information.
9. To enable the pupil to express his own individuality and to receive a modifying influence from the class.
10. To give opportunity for the student to *do* and *to be* rather than merely *to know*, by thinking, reasoning, judging, and making decisions.

II. *The Assignment and Preparation for the Socialized Recitation.*

The assignment in history is very important, and is given in such a way that the students know exactly what they are expected to learn. Aside from assigning a very few pages in the text, the teacher points out some of the most important things for the students to stress in their collateral reading. He gives them something definite to do—a question to answer,

a topic to discuss, an outline to make, a problem to solve. If possible each lesson is assigned in the form of one or more problems. (Often the recitation period is devoted to debating some important historical question.)

In assigning collateral reading the teacher asks the students to read books suited to their interests and capacities, and those phases of history which have the deepest moral effect, are studied diligently. By selecting well-chosen topics, questions, and problems that are adapted to the capacity of the pupils, and by requiring them to gather their information from various books, papers and magazines, the pupils are trained to collect historical material, to arrange it, and to put it forth. This practice, the Committee of Seven maintains, "develops capacity for effective work, not capacity for absorption alone."

III. *The History Notebook and the Socialized Recitation.*

In gathering their information, the students are warned to be careful not to take too many notes, but on the other hand, they are strongly advised to take a few notes and the reasons for so doing are given: (1) It helps to make knowledge concrete and definite, first-hand and authoritative; (2) it places the gathered information in definite and effective relation with the organized course; (3) it enables the teacher to check up assigned reading; (4) and lastly, it forces the student to reproduce in written form the gist of his reading, and to sift and pass judgment upon it.

The notebook, which is used in recitation, includes not merely outlines from the textbook, but extracts from source and parallel reading, illustrations and corrective and supplementary comments by the

¹ The "aims" were formulated by William Whitney. See his monograph, "The Socialized Recitation," A. S. Barnes Co., New York City.

teacher with, best of all, some reflections and comparisons by the student himself. Part of the work is written with care, so that it may be preserved in later life with justifiable pride. Even outlines which may be part of a good epitome, are often thrown into the form of clear and definite sentences for the sake of correct habits of expression.

"The advantages of such a system are obvious; it breaks up the servile adherence to the limited text of a single book; it trains in the use of books; in the selection of pertinent facts out of a mass of material; it leads to the comparison of authors, the explanation of discrepancies, the weighing of authorities; it adds life and interest to the work."

IV. How My Classes in History are Conducted.

As already stated, often the assignment is given in the form of a problem with references, but if no suitable problem can be found in the lesson for the day, the assignment is made and the recitation is conducted as follows:

The lesson is divided into four or five parts, and the leader is assigned for each part. The duty of each leader is to outline his part of the lesson, prepare questions and gather outside information pertaining to every subdivision of his outline, and bearing on all the questions he has prepared.

In the recitation, the leaders who have made special preparation (as given in the preceding paragraph) are requested to question the class just as the teacher would.

Volunteers are not called upon until two other pupils have attempted to answer the question. If the two students do not satisfy the leader and other students, volunteers are called upon to correct any errors or give additional information.

The members of the class are allowed to ask any questions not previously made clear or they may present new questions. Then volunteers present new material based on collateral reading. The leader finally offers his additional information. In case all the important points are not brought out clearly, the teacher asks his questions in order to emphasize those essentials.

V. Points to be Noted.

Conversations and discussions are transferred to the class circle. Discussions, questions, criticisms are drawn in pupils, with the teacher only occasionally drawn in. There is quite a contrast between this plan and the old when the recitation was always between teacher and some pupil.

The teacher is a guide and does not do the reciting for the class. He encourages both freedom and desire to offer additional facts or to make inquiry concerning points discussed. Corrections are noticed and discussed by the pupils. In this phase of the work, the students are advised to make constructive, rather than destructive criticisms.

The teacher corrects errors and supplements the work of the students. However, he takes part only when necessary. The teacher merely directs the

work, counsels with the pupils, advises and leads, without dominating and suppressing the physical and mental life within the room.

VI. What are the Advantages of the Socialized Recitation?

To think, to become responsible, to be interested, to be aroused, to want to put forth effort, to do something for others, to feel their part in the recitation—this social consciousness is stimulated by the new plan of recitation. "The socialized recitation makes the school-room real, life-like and natural." Many students tell me that "it does away with the old monotony." William Whitney maintains that when the socialized recitation is used "the students become members of a working community which adopts the principles of character and good citizenship as the standard of living and working."

It is simply a way of giving the self-reliance and initiative within a group the maximum opportunity to develop. This form of recitation arouses more interest, more sense of co-operation between the students and between the teacher and students, and a wider freedom of self-expression than does the ordinary recitation. Responsibility and leadership become pleasurable realities in boys and girls who feel themselves expanding under its burdens. The spirit of the group is more friendly and earnest. But the greatest of all the advantages is the training given the student in how to study, how to think, and how to express thought.

The plan and its details are so full of interest, so dynamic, so fruitful of good to the average pupil, so fascinating as a method of teaching that every teacher will find it worthy of serious consideration. This method of recitation makes the pupil think for himself. Instead of being required to listen most of the time to the teacher and to remember what he has expressed, the pupil himself becomes an investigator, and having found out for himself, expresses himself in his recitation. He is cross-questioned by the class and made to defend his position. The doing of these things makes him careful and accurate. It cultivates habits of expression. It makes him confident. It develops leadership. Graduates of elementary schools where this method is followed usually get all the best honors and class leadership offices in the high schools which they afterward enter. The plan solves the question of order and discipline. Disorder is usually the result of idleness and inattention. These do not exist where the socialized recitation plan is followed.

After reviewing the answers to a questionnaire pertaining to methods employed by teachers of history, civics, and economics in Seattle High Schools, Superintendent Frank B. Cooper stated that the teachers agree that the method is necessary to arouse interest and to encourage intelligent thinking, an essential for citizenship in a democracy; to develop fair-mindedness; to get a clear understanding of problems; to cultivate a sense of knowing different views in arriving at conclusions based on a broad knowledge; because pupils learn not to swallow blindly one au-

thority; because the test of authority is investigation; because the teacher is not in class to impose personal opinions; because wrong personal views are corrected; because hearsay evidence is discredited."

Superintendent Cooper said further that "it tends to induce the thinking habit, to encourage the weighing of opinions, and a comparison of facts before decision. It aims to blaze the way to just conclusions, rather than to arrive at conclusions, for there are numerous problems studied as to which satisfactory conclusions have not yet been reached. My only comment upon these returns is that this city is highly fortunate in being served by a body of teachers which shows the intelligence, wisdom and fine spirit of service and patriotism that are disclosed in the answers to these questions." The report was adopted.

VII. The Socialized Recitation from the Students' Standpoint.

BY VIOLET HARRISON.

We are beginning to-day a new era. Freedom has become the motto of the world; freedom from old tyrannies, freedom of thought, in fact, true freedom.

Surely when new and efficient methods are replacing the old in so many things, a change should come in school methods which would encourage greater freedom of thought on the part of the pupils.

The socialized recitation gives to the students both freedom of thought and requires efficiency. It also stimulates their initiative and originality.

As a student, the socialized recitation appeals to me because the former dullness and dryness of the period is eliminated, and it becomes a period of mental activity. This change comes from the fact that the pupils are interested in their work rather than the grade they will receive.

By the question and answer method little real interest in the subject was aroused in the pupils. It was too monotonous. A class conducted according to the socialized recitation is not monotonous, because each day something new and interesting is brought to the pupils' attention.

Questions are brought before the class, and often problems arise from them for the students to discuss.

Class discussion converts the recitation period into one of hard and quick thinking, in which the student does his best studying under the stimulus of his fellow-students and teacher. The text-book serves as an outline of topics to be considered.

The pupils, to prove their points, must necessarily read outside information, and this they are willing to do because they have the proper incentive. Questions or suggestions put the student into action, but the teacher is there to formulate problems, not to supply answers before the questions have been raised within the learner's mind.

Where there is no interest in a subject, where there is no question in the student's mind, there can be no searching for an answer.

Where there is no problem, there is no occasion for the mind to think hard. The problems we discuss are

not only those given by the teacher, but those coming from the pupils, and therefore interesting to them and of more practical value.

The student's viewpoint is broadened; the teacher and the text-book are not the only authorities. Through class discussions the opinions of the other students are heard, and the pupils learn by experience to form opinions of their own, regarding the problems brought up.

The socialized recitation is one of expression rather than repression. The student is given the opportunity to express himself without the restraint usually felt in classes.

The socialized recitation is more democratic than the old method, as it is the students who do the governing, not one person, the teacher.

As the class must work together to gain the desired results, co-operation becomes a part of the training. Instead of each pupil working solely for his own benefit, each works for the benefit of the whole class.

Because the responsibility rests on them rather than the teacher, the pupils become more self-assured.

Progress is made by considering new ideas. A student under the socialized recitation must make progress not only in the subject, but also along other lines.

The student's interests are widened, new paths of knowledge open for him. He is started thinking along new lines and awakened to better things.

The business world of to-day is looking for men and women with initiative and originality. The socialized recitation stimulates both of these qualities in the students.

Closed Versus Open Book Test

BY MERRILL J. BURR, PRINCIPAL, MINERAL COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL, HAWTHORNE, NEVADA.

Why study history? To learn a lot of dates and other unimportant facts? If you want to exercise the memory, learn something worth while. To study out the military campaigns? That might be of some help if we are to become generals. To learn how other peoples lived and were governed? Very interesting sometimes, but of what use in earning a living except to the lecturer or the research worker? Unless there is some connection between history and the life around us, some definite result gained from the study of history, it has no value. Mere knowledge is of no value unless it can be applied, and history is no exception. Application of knowledge requires the exercise of the reasoning powers. Then the study of history to be of value must call forth the development of thought and the ability to reason.

How then can we develop thought and the ability to reason in the study of history? The "closed book test," or the giving of written tests with all books closed, generally brings memory only into play. Teachers, who give the closed book test, as a rule have no incentive to ask questions which require the use of reasoning powers. This is especially true of

teachers working under the fallacious theory that "anyone can teach history." But let a teacher try to make out a set of questions knowing that the student is to be allowed to use his text-book and note-book all he pleases while answering the questions—this is the principle of the so-called "open book test"—those questions must be such that they require thought and not mere memory, otherwise the test will be a farce, the student copying almost directly from the books before him.

Knowledge of the subject matter is essential for the proper basis from which to begin the discussion, but a few questions at the beginning of the recitation should be sufficient for this phase of the work. The remainder of the period should be spent in practical application of the several events of the lesson. In history, questions of why and how should greatly outnumber those of what and where.

Below is a set of questions illustrating both systems. The advantages of the open book over the closed book test as far as making history live, practical, and of real educational value can be clearly seen.

I.

Closed book.—Compare France and Nevada as to (1) physical features, (2) population, (3) industries.

Open book.—Compare France and Nevada in every way that you can.

II.

Closed book.—Define history.

Open book.—"History is the knowledge that we have, or can have, of man's life in the past, especially as it was lived in society with other men." (Harding's "New Medieval and Modern History," page 11.) Explain the meaning of the above quotation.

III.

Closed book.—What is meant by the Age of Chivalry? How did it develop in France?

Open book.—"Chivalry, then, may be defined as the moral and social law and custom of the noble and gentle class in Western Europe during the later Middle Ages, and the results of that law and custom in action." ("Chivalry," by F. Warre Cornish, page 13.)

Explain this definition in connection with France, mother of heroes, mother of honor, mother of glory.

IV.

Closed book.—Why does France claim Alsace-Lorraine?

Open book.—Give reason for the Allies saying that Germany stole Alsace-Lorraine from France. What reasons could Germany give to lay claim to the same territory?

EXPLANATION OF QUESTIONS.

The plan followed in the class from which these open book test questions were given was taken mainly from the article in *THE HISTORY TEACHER'S MAGAZINE* of October, 1917.

Question I.—Some of the comparisons had been discussed in class, but there was plenty of room for the student to think out other comparisons.

Question II.—Various definitions and meanings of history with their application had been worked over in class, but not this particular one which is somewhat fuller than the others. The chapter including this quotation had been assigned for study, however, in the class.

Question III.—The "what is meant by" question is a very easy one for the teacher to ask, but it seldom brings a satisfactory answer. "Chivalry" is a vague sort of word to the average student; they know what it means, but they can not define it very well. The open book question gives them a definition, and asks them to apply it to France during the Middle Ages. (One freshman girl gave an excellent answer to this question.)

Question IV.—The Alsace-Lorraine question had been taken up in the diagram also, and mention had been made of several articles in the magazines, but no special enumeration of reasons had been formulated.

PROS AND CONS.

The open book system has its drawbacks, as does nearly every scheme of teaching. It takes time and considerable thought on the part of the teacher to formulate questions that can be answered with the books open and still be a test of the development of the student; but no true history teacher will balk at the extra work if she sees the good results of her labors.

Then again the student is liable to spend too much time in trying to find an answer in his book, at least when the plan is first tried. After a short time, however, he learns to study his text-book and mark his note-book so that he can turn quickly to any little clew that may help him to answer the question rightly. This ability to find what you want quickly is a real benefit in itself. He soon sees that he will not "get by" unless he thinks for himself.

In grading such open book test careful judgment must be used. The development of the reasoning powers, not merely what they say, should be the basis of the marking. An honest effort, although not right, deserves a passing grade, at least, until the system has been thoroughly tried out and the student knows what is expected of him. The memory questions asked at the beginning of the recitation will serve as a guide to the teacher in marking according to the closed book way; she can then increase the grade as she observes a corresponding increase in the student's ability to reason and reason rightly.

DEFINITE RESULTS.

This sort of training in history, and especially in civil government, should fit the graduate to think for himself, and not be at the whim of every politician that happens to take his fancy, when he is confronted with the various duties and privileges of citizenship.

The Confederation and the Constitution

BY MAE CROSSMAN BIDWELL, HIGH SCHOOL, MT. KISCO, N. Y.

Five days' work for fourth year high school with bibliography.

Basis of work—history secondary syllabus.

PERSONNEL OF CLASS.

(Representative Types.)

Burns, Sarah—Strong pupil, capable, thorough.
Potter, Laura—Honor student, history hungry, sees the "why."

Carman, Ada—Plodding, thorough, not keen.
Fuller, Ruth—Excellent student, good thinker.
Allen, Earnest—Fair student, can get facts.
Burrows, Irving—Young, likes fights, military history, debates.

Brown, Irene—Average, "hates history."
Sandford, Bertha—Faithful worker, no thinker.
Drake, Charles—Fond of debates, interested in legal aspect.

Danby, Ethel—Fairly good, not deep.
Evans, Isadore—Average or below.
La Fort, Joseph—Mathematician, clear and keen mind.
Lamb, Charles—Natural history student, fond of debate.
Cole, Caroline—Young, bright, quick.
Dunham, Maude—Good student, thorough.
Cady, Winifred—Reliable, not independent thinker.
Smith, Milford—Strong student, keen, mature.

Assignments are related to ability and characteristics of individual pupils.

MONDAY.

A. Previous assignment.

Read period of confederation and constitution in any two histories for secondary schools.

B. Class work. Text-books. Open.

Question, "What are the three most important things you found in your reading?"

Volunteers, Articles of Confederation, Ordinance of 1787, Constitution.

Class divided into three sections with pencils and books, develop outlines on each of above headings. (Five minutes.)

Have one of each put on board. Call for revision and additions. When completed, have pupils copy each revised outline.

These outlines should cover the following, but not necessarily be identical. As the result of pupils' work, they are much more valuable than models given by the teacher.

Assign lessons for Tuesday to individuals. If class is larger, pupils may be grouped according to character and interests.

LESSON FOR TUESDAY.

Surnames—Articles of Confederation.

(a) History of formation and ratification.

Burns, Cady—Hart, Formation of Union, 93-95; West, Source Book, 470-475; Johnson, Union and Democracy, 1-8.

(b) Leading features.

Lamb—American history leaflets, No. 20.

(c) Defects.

Allen—Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 41; Caldwell-Persinger, Source History, 233-236.

Potter—Winsor, America, Vol. VII, Chap. III, 215-236; Hart, Formation of Union, p. 104.

(d) Strength.

Drake—West, American History and Government, p.

289, ¶ 194; (Courts under Articles) Hart, Formation of Union, 105.

(e) Attempts to amend.

Evans, Danby—Caldwell-Persinger, Source, p. 237; Hart, Formation of Union, p. 118; West, American History and Government, 289-291.

(f) Weakness as shown by

1. Trouble with army.

Dunham—Fiske, Critical Period, 105-119.

Burrows—Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 38.

2. Foreign relations.

Cole—West, American History, 283-4.

La Fort—Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 45.

3. Boundary disputes of states.

Carman—McMaster, I, 210-216 (Wyoming Valley).

4. Trade discriminations.

Brown, Sandford—West, American History, 284-5; Fiske, Critical Period, 146-7. (Read in Winsor also.)

5. Paper money craze.

Fuller—West, American History, 285-287; Johnson, Union and Democracy, 17-20. (Trevett vs. Weeden.)

Smith—Schouler, I, 32-4; West, Source Book, 497-9; Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 58. (Shay's Rebellion.)

CLASS PERIOD, TUESDAY.

Topical recitation. Allow two minutes each.

Pupils *must* be ready to give essentials and show relation of topic to conditions in few words.

Brown, Allen, Evans—All inclined to talk "around" topic.

Show *clearly* conditions. Develop elements of strength opening the way for the greatest work of the Confederation—The Ordinance of 1787.

Last ten minutes of recitation show map opposite page 108 in McLaughlin's "Confederation and Constitution."

ASSIGNMENT FOR WEDNESDAY.

The Northwest and the Ordinance of 1787.

I. The territory.

1. Claims of states (map studies for class).

2. Cessions of states.

Fuller—American History Leaflets, No. 22.

3. The country.

Evans—Hart, Contemporaries, III, p. 110. (Bring to class for reading.)

II. The Northwest Ordinance.

1. Importance.

Lamb—Old South Leaflets, No. 13, pp. 9, 10, 11.

2. Jefferson's plan of 1784.

Allen—Fiske, Critical Period, 196-8.

3. Ordinance of 1787 (features as basis of future power).

Class—West, Source Book, 488-496; Caldwell-Persinger, Source History, 241-4. (Good.)

a. Government.

b. Special provisions.

1. Slavery.

2. Education.

3. Religious freedom.

4. Property.

4. Land grants for education, 1787.

Burrows—West, American History, 273.

5. Rectangular survey (explain to class).

La Fort—West, American History, 270-3.

6. Land companies and settlement.

Carman—West, American History, 274-6; Fiske, Critical Period, 203; Caldwell-Persinger, Source, 260.

Class reference—Old South Leaflets, Nos. 41, 10, 40.

WEDNESDAY, CLASS PERIOD.

Part of class at board. Write on Ordinance of 1787, giving principal provisions.

One-minute paragraphs (about 100 words) written by pupils having special topics to be handed in and read by teacher, except Lamb and La Fort. Lamb gives Hoar's opinion of importance of the ordinance. La Fort explains rectangular survey.

General discussion followed by ten minutes in which pupils write on:

"Why the Northwest Ordinance was the greatest work of the Confederation Congress."

Hand in papers at close of period.

LESSON FOR THURSDAY.

The Federal Convention and the Constitution.

I. Need of change in government.

1. As shown by political and economic conditions. Review.

2. Opinions of prominent men.

Drake—a. Hamilton, Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 54; b. John Jay, Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 59.

Burrows—c. Washington, West, Source Book, 500-501; d. Webster, Hart, Form of Union, 119.

3. Influence of failure of amendment.

Cady—Schouler, I, 34-35.

II. The Mount Vernon meeting.

Burns—Johnson, Union and Democracy, 25-29; Fiske, Critical Period, 213-216.

Brown—West, American History, 293-4; Schouler, I, 30.

III. The Annapolis Convention.

Dunham—Caldwell-Persinger, 267-8; West, Source Book, 506-9; Schouler, I, 31.

IV. Proposals for Constitutional Convention.

Carman—Caldwell-Persinger, Source, 238-9.

V. The Convention.

1. States represented, time and place.

2. Men present (and not present).

Lamb—Fiske, Critical Period, 224-5, and West, Source Book, 523-32.

Smith—West, American History, 299; Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 62.

3. Plans.

La Fort—a. Randolph's (Madison) or Virginia plan. Caldwell-Persinger, Source, 270-1.

Danby—b. New Jersey, West, Source Book, 518-21. (Cf. Article VI, United States Constitution.) c. Pinckney.

Cole—d. Hamilton, Schouler, I, 38-41.

4. Debates.

5. The great compromises.

Fuller—West, American History, 304-312; Schouler, I, p. 41.

Burrows—Johnson, Union and Democracy, 30-44.

6. Procedure of convention (unimportant, but gives student knowledge of care taken in formation).

Sandford—West, American History, 302-3.

7. Who made the Constitution? Why?

Potter—West, Source Book, 503-5, 517; West, American History, 295-9; Johnson, Union and Democracy, 43-4.

THURSDAY, CLASS PERIOD.

Each pupil is to write a paragraph of not more than 150 words on his topic—a report. These to be numbered in order and read orally as a class history of the constitution.

Pupils take notes and revise them in discussion.

To vitalize the lesson, read "One Day in Philadelphia," from Caldwell-Persinger's Source History. Assign to some pupil a ten-minute quiz for review in Friday's recitation.

(The last point (7) should have special emphasis, and therefore should be given to keenest pupil in the class.)

FRIDAY'S ASSIGNMENT.

Ratification of Constitution.

Ratification calendar will be found on pages 50-51, Harding's Select Orations. Let three best readers look up in this book, Henry's (66-87), Wilson's (54-65), and Hamilton's (103-121) speeches, and each have five minutes in class to read their selections from speeches. Jefferson's opinion (Caldwell-Persinger, page 279) is also interesting.

Class—study topic in text and in one other history.

List of references—Schouler, I, Elson, Channing, Sparks, McMaster, I; Hart, Formation (128-135); Walker, Making of Nation (51-62); Fiske, Critical Period, Chap. VII; Bancroft, VI.

FRIDAY, CLASS PERIOD.

Readings by pupils.

Teacher reads selection from "Building of Ship," Longfellow and mock criticism of constitution. Hart, Contemporaries, III, No. 70.

Discuss following:

Five rights guaranteed in Northwest Ordinance which appear in Constitution. Where?

Cf. Article of Confederation with Constitution as to

1. Representation.

2. Methods of raising money.

3. Voting in Congress.

4. Amendments.

Some ways in which constitution remedied defects of article. Some men who opposed ratification.

The Federalist.

These cannot be fully discussed until later, but will interest pupils in study of constitution the following week.

MONDAY'S ASSIGNMENT.

Read life of some prominent supporter of Constitution—Madison, Wilson, Hamilton, preferred.

STUDENTS' BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Section Texts—

McLaughlin, History of United States.

Muzzey, American History.

Hart, Essentials of American History.

Channing, Student's History of United States.

Thompson, History of United States.

Sources—

West, Source Book.

Hart and Channing, American History Leaflets.

Hart, Contemporaries, III.

Caldwell-Persinger, Source History of United States.

Harding, Select Orations.

Reference Books—

Winsor, Critical and Narrative History of America, Vol. VII.

Schouler, History of United States, Vol. I.

McMaster, History of United States, Vol. I.

Bancroft, History of United States, Vol. VI.

Hart, Formation of Union.

Johnson, Union and Democracy.

West, American History and Government.

Elson, History of United States.

Channing, United States, Chapter IV.

Sparks, United States, Vol. I, 1-18, 67-78.

Walker, Making of the Nation.

Hinsdale, Old Northwest.

Gay, Madison.

Lodge, Washington.

Sumner, Hamilton.

Bellew, John Jay.

TEACHER'S BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Articles on Teaching—

Millspaugh, Notes on History Teaching, *School Review*, December, 1914.

Millspaugh, Live History, *Independent*, September 11, 1916.

Fourth Yearbook of National Herbart Society, pages 28-29.

Wolfson, Efficiency of History Recitation, *Educational Review*, May, 1913.

Sources—

Same as in students' list, and

Macdonald, Documents 2, 4, 5.

Hill, Liberty Documents, Chapter XVII.

Histories—

Same is in students' list, and

Ferrand, Max, The Constitution.

Bryce, J., American Commonwealth.

Hart, Actual Government.

Larned, History for Ready Reference, V, 3289-96.

Beard, American Government and Politics.

Simons, Social Forces in American History.

Frothingham, Rise of Republic of United States.

Fiske, Development of American Nationality.

Carman, Industrial History of United States.

Bogart, Economic History of United States.

Biographies—

Gay, Madison.

Lodge, Hamilton.

Tyler, Patrick Henry.

Lodge, Washington.

Hosmer, Samuel Adams.

History in the Summer Schools, 1919

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

BERKELEY, CALIF., JUNE 30 TO AUGUST 9, 1919.

Professor Wm. Sloane; Professor H. E. Bolton; Professor J. J. Van Nostrand; Professor D. E. Barrows; Dr. L. Ehrlich; Professor E. Dawson.

Recent European History. Professor Sloane.

The Growth of Democracy. Professor Sloane.

Spanish-American History. Professor Bolton.

Development of Western America. Professor Bolton.

Roman History. Professor J. J. Van Nostrand.

The Teaching of History. Professor J. J. Van Nostrand.

International Relations: The Far East. Professor Barrows.

American Foreign Policy. Professor Barrows.

Comparative Government. Dr. Ehrlich.

Origin and Political Issues of the Great War. Dr. Ehrlich.

Problems of Organized Democracy. Professor Dawson.

Teaching Government in Secondary Schools. Professor Dawson.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CHICAGO, ILL., JUNE 15 TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1919.

European History: The Medieval Period, 376-1390. Mr. Joranson.

European History: The Later Medieval and Early Modern Period, 1300-1715. Mr. Joranson.

History of Antiquity: IV. Civilization of the Mediterranean World from Alexander to Caesar. Assistant Professor Huth.

Roman Imperialism. Assistant Professor Huth.

The Dark Ages, 180 A. D. to 814 A. D. Professor Thompson.

Europe and the Orient in the Middle Ages: The Crusades. Professor Thompson.

The Renaissance. Professor Hulme.

The Reformation and the Religious Wars, 1500-1648. Professor Hulme.

Europe in the Nineteenth Century. Professor Lingelbach.

Imperial England. Professor Terry.

History of the United States: Division and Reunion, 1829-1919. Professor Cox.

History of Spanish America. Professor Cox.

Studies in the Social and Economic History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century. Professor Lingelbach.

The End of the Great War. Dr. Scott.

The English Constitution and the Rise of Modern Democracy. (First period) "The Squireocracy Supreme." Professor Terry.

The Social and Industrial History of the American Colonies. Professor Jernegan.

Constitutional History of the Colonial Period. Dr. Scott.

Problems in Recent American History, 1898-1919. Associate Professor Jernegan.

United States History: The Old South, 1763-1833. Professor Dodd.

Monroe Doctrine in Recent World-Politics. Professor Dodd.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

NEW YORK CITY, JULY 7 TO AUGUST 15, 1919.

American History. Mr. Caldwell.

Ancient History. Mr. Caldwell.

The Foundations of Modern Europe. Dr. Morgan.

Modern and Contemporary European History. Professor Kendrick and Dr. W. T. Morgan.

A Survey of American History to 1789. Dr. Fox.

The Ancient Orient. Professor Rogers.

The Hebrews. Professor Rogers.

Greek History to the End of the Peloponnesian War. Professor Magoffin.

Roman History to the End of the Republic. Professor Magoffin.

The Development of Europe from Charlemagne to the French Revolution. Professor Mitchell.

The Old Regime. The French Revolution and the Work of Napoleon. Professor Muzzey.

History of England from the Opening of the Seventeenth Century to the Present Time. Professor Mitchell.

The United States, 1815-1850. Dr. Fox.

Survey of the History of the United States. Professor Muzzey.

Latin America and Its Relations with the United States. Professor Shepherd.

European History Since 1815.

The United States, 1876-1914. Professor Kendrick.

The Expansion of Europe, 1785-1918. Professor Shepherd.

The History of European Diplomacy, 1871-1914.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., JULY 1 TO SEPTEMBER 13, 1919.

Professor C. H. Haskins; Professor C. H. McIlwain; Mr. F. Merk; Dr. S. E. Morison; Professor A. N. Holcombe.

European History from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the Present Time. Professor Haskins.

European History from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the Present Time. Professor Haskins.

History of France. Professor Haskins.

English History to 1688. Professor McIlwain.

English History from 1688 to the Present Time. Professor McIlwain.

Problems of the War and of Reconstruction. Professor Haskins.

American History. Mr. Merk.
 History of the United States from 1830 to the Present Time. Mr. Merk.
 The Influence of New England Upon the Nation. Dr. Morison.
 Advanced Work in History for Graduate Students. Professor Haskins.
 Modern Government. Government of the United States. Professor Holcombe.
 Modern Government. European Governments. Professor Holcombe.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BALTIMORE, MD., JULY 8 TO AUGUST 15, 1919.

Professor James M. Callahan; Associate Professor Herman L. Ebeling; Mr. A. M. Isanogle; Dr. J. Broadus Mitchell.

American Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, 1776-1919. Professor Callahan.

American Development, 1776-1829. Professor Callahan.
 Modern English History. Professor Callahan.
 Roman History. Associate Professor Ebeling.
 The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools. Mr. A. M. Isanogle.

American Economic History. Dr. Mitchell.
 Elements of Economics. Dr. Mitchell.
 The Child in Industry. Dr. Mitchell.

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

MANHATTAN, KANSAS, JUNE 6 TO AUGUST 8, 1919.

American History.
 English History.
 Modern Europe.
 Teachers' Course in History.
 American Nation. I.
 Modern History, II.
 American Government.
 Current History.
 Civics.
 Sociology.
 Rural Sociology.
 Economics.
 Money and Banking.
 Public Finance.
 Labor Problems.
 Business Organization.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.

LAWRENCE, KANSAS, JUNE 17 TO JULY 25, JULY 28 TO AUGUST 22.

FIRST TERM.

Modern England.
 American Government, I.
 Greater European Governments.
 Reconstruction in American History.
 War and Peace.
 Municipal Government.
 Seminar in American History.
 Elements of Economics.
 The Economics of the War.
 Banking.
 Labor Problems.
 Elements of Sociology.
 Immigration and Race Problems in United States.
 Eugenics.
 Community Organization.
 Seminar of Sociology.
 Seminar of Social Investigation.

SECOND TERM.

American Government, II.
 International Law.
 Commercial Geography.
 Life Insurance.
 Social Pathology.

Remedial and Corrective Agencies.
 Public Opinion.
 The Family.
 Seminar of Sociology.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

BATON ROUGE, LA., JUNE 17 TO JULY 30.

Professor Albert C. Holt.
 Contemporary Historical Problems.
 Territorial Expansion of the United States.
 Methods of Teaching History.

OBERLIN COLLEGE.

OBERLIN, O., JUNE 20 TO AUGUST 7, 1919.

Professor C. B. Martin; Professor R. D. Moore; Professor H. L. Lutz.
 Greek History: Athens in the Time of Pericles. Professor Martin.
 Europe from 1870 to November 11, 1918. Professor Moore.
 American Foreign Policy and America in the War. Professor Moore.
 War Issues and the Peace Conference. Professor Moore.
 Reconstruction Problems. Professor Lutz.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

COLUMBUS, O., JUNE 23 TO AUGUST 15, 1919.

Professor A. M. Schlesinger; Mr. Carl Wittke; Professor W. H. Allison; Professor George A. W. Washburne.
 History of the United States, 1763-1829. Mr. Wittke.
 History of the United States, 1829-1916. Mr. Wittke.
 History of Canada. Mr. Wittke.
 American Diplomacy to the Close of the Civil War. Mr. Schlesinger.
 Some Revisions of American History. Mr. Schlesinger.
 Seminar in American History. Mr. Schlesinger.
 Medieval History. Mr. Allison.
 History of Rome. Mr. Washburne.
 Problems of World Peace and Reconstruction. Mr. Washburne and others.
 The Period of the Reformation. Mr. Allison.
 Europe from 1815 to 1919. Mr. Washburne.
 The Teaching of European History. Mr. Allison.

GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS.

NASHVILLE, TENN., JUNE 12 TO JULY 23, JULY 24 TO AUGUST 29, 1919.

Professor M. L. Bonham; Professor G. W. Dyer; Professor W. L. Fleming.
 American History. Mr. Bonham.
 American History. Mr. Bonham.
 Government and Politics in the United States. Mr. Dyer.
 Ancient Civilization. Mr. Fleming.
 Medieval Civilization. Mr. Fleming.
 The Teaching of History. Mr. Bonham.
 Methods in American History. Mr. Bonham.
 The Great War. Mr. Fleming.
 The United States and the War. Mr. Fleming.
 International Law. Mr. Fleming.
 American Diplomacy. Mr. Fleming.
 The British Empire. Mr. Bonham.
 Modern France. Mr. Bonham.
 Seminar in American History. Mr. Bonham and Mr. Fleming.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE.

STATE COLLEGE, PA., JUNE 30 TO AUGUST 8, 1919.

Professor Jacob Tanger; Professor A. E. Martin.
 Civil Government of the United States. Professor Tanger.
 International Law and Politics. Professor Tanger.
 The United States Since 1846. Professor Martin.

Teachers' Course. Professor Martin.
General European History. Professor Tanger.
European International Relations. Professor Martin.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

PITTSBURGH, PA., JUNE 30 TO AUGUST 23, 1919.

Modern Europe (1500-1919). Professor Webster.
American Political History.
History of the Roman Republic. Professor Ullman.
Rise of American Democracy and Nationality (1800-1829).
History of Greece. Professor Scribner.
American Historians. A study of the leading American historians and their works.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF., JUNE 17 TO AUGUST 30, 1919.

Professor E. D. Adams; Professor A. B. Shaw; Professor P. A. Martin.
Methods of History Teaching. Professor Shaw.
General Survey Course in Medieval European History. Professor Shaw.
General Survey Course in Latin-American History. Professor Martin.
Latin American Institutions. Professor Martin.
Recent American History to the End of the Great War. Professor Adams.
Advanced Seminar in American Diplomatic History. Professor Adams.
Special Research Work for Graduate Students. Professors Adams, Shaw and Martin.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

AUSTIN, TEXAS, JUNE 10 TO JULY 22, JULY 22 TO AUGUST 30.

Professor E. C. Barker; Professor R. P. Brooks; Professor F. Duncalf; Professor F. B. Marsh; Professor T. M. Marshall; Professor C. H. Cunningham; Professor C. W. Ramsdell; Professor C. S. Boucher; Professor L. M. Larson; Dr. A. K. Christian; Mr. W. P. Webb.

FIRST TERM.

The Early Middle Ages, 395-814. Mr. Webb.
The Feudal Age, 814-1300. Mr. Webb.
The Close of the Middle Ages, 1300-1500. Dr. Christian.
Europe in the Nineteenth Century. Professor Marsh.
The American Colonies and the Revolution, 1492-1789. Professor Marshall.
National Development and Expansion, 1789-1869. Dr. Christian.
Division and Reunion, 1860-1918. Professor Brooks.
The Westward Movement, 1763-1848. Professor Marshall.
History of the South. Professor Brooks.
The Formation of the Constitution. Professor Barker.
History Teaching. Professor Duncalf.
Foreign Relations of the United States, 1820-1860. Professor Barker.
France in the Nineteenth Century. Professor Marsh.
The Early Renaissance. Professor Duncalf.

SECOND TERM.

The Close of the Middle Ages, 1300-1500. Dr. Christian.
The American Colonies and the Revolution, 1492-1789. Professor Cunningham.
National Development and Expansion, 1789-1860. Professor Ramsdell.
Division and Reunion, 1860-1918. Professor Boucher.
The History of Texas, 1803-1846. Dr. Christian.
The Civil War. Professor Ramsdell.
The American Revolution, 1750-1783. Professor Boucher.
The Establishment of the Latin-American Colonies. Professor Cunningham.
The Beginning of the British Empire. Professor Larson.
Recent English History. Professor Larson.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

MADISON, WIS., JUNE 30 TO AUGUST 8.

Professor F. L. Paxson; Professor D. C. Munro; Professor Knaplund; Professor Hicks; Professor W. J. Chase.
Medieval History.
History of United States.
The Crusades.
History of the West.
Recent History of United States, 1898-1918.
The World War.
Europe, 1815-1918.
Teaching of History.
History and Historians.
Seminary in Historical Method.
Seminary in American History.

PUBLISHERS' NOTICE.

The issuing of the June number of "The Historical Outlook" will be delayed a few days in order to include in the number the report on the high school history course from the Committee of History and Education for Citizenship. It is believed that this report will be of such value to our readers that the delay will be considered by all as justifiable.

The Historical Outlook

A JOURNAL FOR READERS, STUDENTS, AND
TEACHERS OF HISTORY.

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine.

Published Monthly, except July, August and September, by
McKINLEY PUBLISHING CO.,
1619 Ranstead Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

ALBERT E. McKINLEY, Editor.

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK was founded in 1909 under the name of *The History Teacher's Magazine*. Its scope and aims gradually broadened until it made an appeal to all persons interested in the historical roots of the present.

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK is an organ of *The American Historical Association* which has appointed an advisory committee composed of Chairman Prof. Henry Johnson, Prof. Fred Morrow Fling, Dr. James Sullivan, Miss Margaret McGill, Prof. Oscar H. Williams, Prof. Frederic Duncalf.

THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK is edited in close co-operation with the *National Board of Historical Service*, of Washington, D. C., composed of the following persons: Prof. D. C. Munro, chairman; Prof. J. Schaefer, vice-chairman; W. G. Leland, secretary-treasurer; Prof. C. Becker, Dr. V. S. Clark, Dr. R. D. W. Connor; Profs. A. C. Coolidge, W. E. Dodd, C. R. Fish, G. S. Ford, E. B. Greene, S. B. Harding, C. H. Haskins, C. D. Hazen, C. H. Hull; Dr. G. Hunt; Dr. J. F. Jameson; Profs. H. Johnson, W. E. Lingelbach, Dr. C. Moore; Major F. L. Paxson; Profs. J. T. Shotwell, and F. J. Turner.

THE SUBSCRIPTION PRICE is two dollars a year. Back numbers are available in bound form at three dollars a volume, and in unbound form at twenty-five cents a copy.

Notes on Periodical Literature

BY GERTRUDE BRAMLETTE RICHARDS, PH.D.

The *National Review* for March, 1919, published the Duke of Northumberland's article on "The League of Nations and Denmark," in which he discusses the restoration of the Danish provinces and Denmark's necessity for defending them. "The true issues of the present international situation are not understood, chiefly owing to the misleading impressions created by the popular conception of a League to enforce peace, and by the Covenant which only confirms these impressions."

The charming illustrations in Maude Going's article on British Guiana in the *Canadian Magazine* for April, add much to the interest of the very careful account of the land and its resources.

The leading article in *Lá Civiltà Cattolica* for February, 1919, is an anonymous contribution dealing with the Peace Conference and the fear of a new war. In it the author considers the question of settlements from the point of view of a priest, rather than of a layman.

"Anonymous Liberalism," the second of Glenn Frank's articles in the *Century*, deals with the conflict in ideals between the business and professional classes.

Major General Sir Frederick Maurice says, in his "Congress of Paris" (*Contemporary Review* for March), when the Germans have disarmed "France will approach the League of Nations in a calmer and more friendly spirit, and will recognize it not as an enunciation of vague principles and high ideals, but as the only practical solution which has yet been advanced of the world-problem of today."

"The Constitution of New Germany," by William Harbutt Dawson (*Fortnightly Review* for March), is an able analysis of the National Assembly which convened at Weimar February 6, 1919, and of the proposed constitution of the Republic. "Of the genuinely democratic spirit of the draft constitution which it is the business of the National Assembly to discuss and shape to its mind, there can be no doubt whatever."

In "Paderewski's Adventure in Patriotism" (*Forum* for March, 1919), Edwina Wildman says: "Into the uproar of Warsaw he came. Bolsheviks threatened him—he was shot at. Politicians raged at him. Military men tried to dictate to him. But the Polish people were behind him and Paderewski put through the coalition cabinet. He got a government organized in Warsaw, representation of all classes, and he emerged as the first Provisional President of Poland. Only the other day his government was recognized by the United States. It is a barrier against Bolshevism. It is an ancient nation brought back to political life. And it was done by a music master—a romancer of idealism in key with the spirit that prompted the entrance of America into the Great War, that gave birth to the freedom of Poland."

President Harry Pratt Judson, of the University of Chicago, in his "The League of Nations and Undeveloped States" (*Review of Reviews* for April), says: "So far as there are unsettled questions relating to any of these forms of more-or-less dependent lands, some permanent principles should now be adopted, in order to avoid, on the one hand, danger of international collision of interests, and on the other hand, the unjust exploitation of the weak by the strong."

Speaking of the League of Nations the first February issue of the *Spectator* says: "When the Constitution of the League has been ratified, with whatever amendments may between now and then be introduced, it will comprise the most sacred treaty in existence—a treaty which any nation will break at its peril."

NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION.

The New England History Teachers' Association held its annual spring meeting on March 22, at the College of Business Administration, Boston University. The general subject considered was "The Teaching of Recent American History." Prof. Frederic L. Paxson, of the University of Wisconsin, gave the main address. The discussion which followed was led by Prof. Theodore C. Smith, of Williams College; Prof. A. D. Hulbert, of Marietta College; Dr. John Haynes, of the Hyde Park High School; William I. Corthell, of the South Boston High School; W. F. Kelley, of the Boston Latin School; Prof. St. George L. Sioussat, of Brown University, and Prof. Karl F. Geiser, of Oberlin University.

A set of resolutions was carried by an overwhelming majority of the members present, approving the appointment by the American Historical Association of a Committee on History and Education for Citizenship, and expressing accord with the general purposes which the committee had in mind.

Luncheon at the Hotel Brunswick followed the meeting. Prof. Raymond Dodge, of Wesleyan University, spoke on "Mental Engineering During the War."

The officers of the Association are: President, George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University; vice-president, Harriet E. Tuell, Somerville High School; secretary and treasurer, Horace Kidger, 82 Madison Avenue, Newtonville; members of the Council, S. B. Aldrich, Albert Farnsworth, Flora M. Greenough, and Orrin C. Hormell.

ANSWER TO INQUIRY.

EDITOR THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK:

Will you kindly inform me where I can obtain descriptions of the Russian land system?

Information in regard to the Russian land question may be found in:

Wallace, D. M., "Russia," 95, 135-136, 360, 465, 507, 516, 549.

Baring, Maurice, "A Year in Russia," pages 88-89, 97-99, 145-147, 178-183.

Mavor, James, "Economic History of Russia," I, II.

Kornilov, A., "History of Russia," II, 42-54, 119-122, 221-222, 237-238.

Pares, Bernard, "Russian Reform," Chapter III.

Struve, Peter, "In Russian Realities and Problems," pages 75-82.

Drage, Geoffrey, "Russian Affairs," pages 85-99, 118-133, 321-324, 582-583.

Manuilov, A., "Agrarian Reform in Russia," in the *Russian Review*, I, No. 4, pages 131-147.

Pares, Bernard, "The New Land Settlement in Russia," in *Russian Review*, I, No. 1, pages 66-74.

Shidlovsky, S., "The Imperial Duma and the Land Settlement," in the *Russian Review*, No. 1, pages 18-26.

"Soviet Legislation," in *The Dial*, December 14, 1918, pages 566-568.

And also in recent numbers of *Current History*, *Survey*, etc. Much valuable information may be gathered from the Russian Year Book.

A. I. A.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY PROFESSOR WAYLAND J. CHASE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

GEISER, KARL FREDERICK. *Democracy versus Autocracy.*

A comparative study of governments in the world war.
New York: D. C. Heath & Co., 1918. Pp. 94. 60 cents.

Among the very desirable results that will follow the recent participation of this country in world affairs we shall doubtless find a widening interest in the governments and affairs of other nations. Our previous provincialism in this respect has been both notable and regrettable. Included as a minimum in the course of every college student there should be such a study of the governments of the great nations as this little book makes possible.

The title does not clearly indicate the contents. It is not an argument, but a statement of facts. First are stated some "determining principles" upon the subject of democracy and autocracy. Next comes a chapter comparing the presidential with the parliamentary system. Under the latter head the governments of England, France and Italy are briefly examined, the representative element of each being clearly set forth.

The greatest part of the book is given to chapters upon the governments of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium and Brazil, as they were before the outbreak of the world war. The descriptions are clear, balanced and stripped of unnecessary detail. In the case of Austria-Hungary alone is any amount of space given to a historical account of the government described.

After affairs in Europe have settled down, an addition to this work, giving accounts of the new governments will constitute it an excellent text for a very brief course in comparative government.

ALBERT H. SANFORD.

State Normal School, La Crosse, Wis.

HACKETT, FRANCIS. *Ireland: A Study in Nationalism.*

New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918. Pp. 410. \$2.00.

Francis Hackett is equipped to write of Ireland. The son of a Kilkenny physician, educated there, he knows the people and their problems as no outsider can. The contrasts which life in America presents have served to heighten dissatisfaction with the regime of his native island. Years of journalistic writing have developed an incisive manner that challenges attention.

The workmanship is that of a literary man rather than a historian. Its foundations are wide acquaintance with and keen understanding of the whole literature of the subject, historical and controversial, but the manner is that of a literary essay. Argument does not run smoothly from premise to conclusion. There are all sorts of decorative allusions, philosophical reflections, graphic descriptions and passages of poetic elevation. All contribute to a style of undoubted brilliance, but they require eager attention. This is no book for a casual glance or an idle hour. It must be read.

The point of view is that of a convinced home ruler. The spirit is critical, critical of England and of Ulster, naturally, but critical also in its attitude toward the Catholic hierarchy, Sinn Fein, the parliamentarians, and the people of South Ireland. The mood is one of restrained passion. Occasionally, however, it flares up with the more intensity because of the attempted restraint. Here and there an intemperate adjective mars the work, but the book never falls into mere abuse. As a whole, it is marked by a fairness and good temper too often wanting in essays on this topic.

Questions of education, religion, agriculture, industry and social conditions are luminously dealt with. The number, range and aptness of the quotations are extraordinary. British official reports are used constantly to lend British authority for the strictures which description of conditions evokes.

By all means the greatest emphasis is put on matters economic. Other problems he conceives to be ancillary to this one. "The safety of the realm, it is perfectly clear, is a transcendent issue; but the kind of unhappiness that befell Ireland did not primarily hinge upon this issue, and it can be corrected without seriously affecting it. The clash of religions is tragic, but remediable. Neither Catholicism nor Presbyterianism excludes the unity and happiness of Irishmen. Nor is there any hopeless difficulty about accommodating the national characteristics of Scotch-Irish, Anglo-Irish, and Irish. . . . National and racial and religious principles enter into all these conflicts, but without a powerful economic element you cannot have explosion. The long step toward political adjustment, to take it the other way, is correction of economic differences."

A satisfactory economic program will come not from English efforts to confer blessings upon Ireland, but through the growth and progress of a free people shaping their own way of life through home rule. The measure of home rule is to be determined by seeking a mean between Sinn Fein and Unionism. "The business of statesmanship is to subtract as much support as possible" from extreme and prejudiced partisans, to yield neither to Southern secession nor Northern nullification. The middle policy is genuine home rule "which gives Ireland complete control of its own finances, its own excise and customs, its conscription; its administration of everything from police force to land purchase, and its place alongside Canada and Australia and South Africa and New Zealand in imperial representation and conference."

HENRY M. WRISTON.

Wesleyan University.

MONBOE, PAUL, AND MILLER, IRVING. *The American Spirit, a Basis for World Democracy.* Ycnkers, N. Y.: The World Book Co., 1918. Pp. 336. \$1.00.

The selections in prose and verse which compose this little reader are intended for use in the grades, but could well be used as a history reference or for supplementary work in English. The selections have been chosen with great care and are appropriate to the purpose for which they are intended—to aid in the development of a consciousness of an American spirit—"to make our children understand and appreciate the American spirit which differentiates us from the Old World." "We have spent a lot of time cherishing an ancient wrong instead of studying the worldwide progress of democracy." Our instruction in patriotism "must go farther than sentiments and feelings," it must have in it something constructive. The selections almost without exception possess literary merit and are representative of all phases of American life and society, although some would seem to be rather advanced for pupils in the grades. American and some English poets are represented, while the prose selections are largely from American state papers and addresses. The index, and table of authors and first lines are excellent additions. The selections are grouped under ten headings: The pioneer spirit, two great Americans (Washington and Lincoln), characteristic ideals, democracy, democracy and life, patriotism, the story of the flag, Americans all, the present crisis, onward.

WM. H. HATHAWAY.

Riverside High School, Milwaukee, Wis.

CHAPMAN, CHARLES E. *A History of Spain, Founded on the Historia de España y de la Civilización Española of Rafael Altamira.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. xv, 559. \$2.60.

This remarkable and excellent book makes no pretense to original scholarship except in three chapters, the one on Charles III and England, 1759-1788, and the two covering the period since 1808. Otherwise the material is confessedly summarized from the four scholarly volumes of the most eminent contemporary Spanish historian. Professor Altamira's model has been Rambaud's "*Histoire de la Civilisation Française*," but he has departed from the practice of his French exemplar by including the political history in his work. Both Rambaud and Altamira, more particularly the latter, owe something of their inspiration to John Richard Green, though their scholarly compilations can not compete in literary form or in power of presentation of the national genius with the masterly "*Short History of the English People*." It is no faint praise to say that Professor Chapman has succeeded in refining Altamira's rich materials into a narrative comparable with Green's in content and method, though inferior in literary charm. The deft selection and unerring sense of proportion have given to Professor Chapman's narrative a clarity and unity unfortunately, though not strangely, lacking in all earlier brief histories of Spain. Most historians of Spain have lost their way in trying to thread the mazes of the early history on which they waste undue time and energy, and have consequently failed to rise above the provincial view of Spain. Professor Chapman succeeds because he contemplates Spain from the imperial point of view. To him Spain is not the daughter of Asturias, but the dominant European state of the sixteenth century which became the mother of the Indies. So, the heart of the book is the group of thirteen chapters (18-30) devoted to the Golden Age from 1479 to 1700; only four of these chapters are political narrative, the other nine depict the institutions, social and economic conditions, and cultural progress. Curiously enough, however, Professor Chapman has failed to follow the logic of his imperial viewpoint and supplement Altamira with two or three chapters on Spain's once great empire overseas.

The space devoted to the nineteenth century, when compared with that given to the Golden Age, is perhaps equitable; but there are strong reasons for departing from the true historical proportions on approaching the present for the purpose of making sufficiently clear the nature of the forces now at work and the character of movements in progress. The Napoleonic intervention, the consequent growth of national and liberal forces, the loss of the continental American colonies, the conflict between clericalism and liberalism, the developments in literature and art, and other topics, surely need more extended treatment if the reader is to close the book with a sense of satisfaction in having been placed in intelligent contact with the life of Spain to-day and of having acquired a proper comprehension of its present position and importance in the affairs of Europe and of the world.

It is an interesting fact that no other country, not even England, has engaged the efforts of American historical writers to such a degree as has Spain and its empire. The tradition established by Irving and passed on by Prescott and Tieknor, by Henry Charles Lea and Bernard Moses, is fortunately not destined to languish since within a few months there have appeared important works on Spain and Spanish America by such able scholars of the younger generation as Professors Merriman, of Harvard; Robertson, of Illinois, and Chapman, of California, and since the establishment of *Hispanic-American Review*.

The question may well be considered whether Spain has not made greater contribution to the world's development than Germany, and whether therefore Spain and its culture ought not for the future to attract American travelers and students to a greatly increased degree. Moreover, the wide and enduring influence of Spain in the Western Hemisphere emphasizes the importance for American citizens of acquaintance with Spanish history, language and culture. Professor Chapman's volume will be a notable stimulus and aid to that end.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Wesleyan University.

HALL-QUEST, ALFRED F. *The Text-book, How to Use and Judge It.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. xiv, 265. \$1.40.

That a man who has made supervised study a subject of extensive investigation and writing should turn his attention to the use of the text-book, seems very natural. It was in this manner that Professor Hall-Quest, of the University of Cincinnati, became interested in what seems to be a new field of investigation, a field the surface of which the author seems merely to have scratched. In the preface and introductory chapters the author sets forth both the importance of the text-book in American education and the fact of its comparative neglect in educational study and writing. The second chapter presents a hurried and somewhat incomplete history of the development of the text-book from earliest to modern times.

The rest of the pages fall naturally into two groups. The first group, comprised of Chapters III and IV, deals with what is mostly an administrative problem, the selecting and supplying of text-books. The advantages of the free text-book system, the problem of the state supply system operating with questionable success in Kansas and California, the good and bad features of the machinations of the professional bookman, are all set forth. Among the practical suggestions concerning the selection of text-books for a city, the committee system of Cincinnati and California is described. The first step in choosing a text-book by a committee is the formulation in writing of the standard requirements for the desired book. Next, companies should be invited to submit books for inspection. Bookmen may then be given opportunity to present in person their publications. Charts showing the amount of space devoted to different divisions of the subject-matter in the different books, and others showing the ratings accorded on the basis of the standard previously set, may then be constructed to help determine the decision.

The other chapters deal with the use of the text-book. Here one finds a cross-section of the entire teaching problem, for one naturally encounters the entire gamut of problems, principles, and practices of teaching. In a brief treatment, such as could be accorded these problems in a book of this kind many features are merely touched upon or omitted altogether. The viewpoint, however, is unusual, and offers good possibilities for future development. The successive chapters present suggestions about the text-book "as a tool," "as a guide," "as a source of knowledge," "as a means of interpreting truths," and "as an incentive or inspiration." The text-book is the very core of our teaching process. For the many teachers of limited experience the proper handling of the text-book both by themselves and their pupils forms the most practical pedagogical problem. For all teachers a study of Professor Hall-Quest's suggestions would be a great help.

The book itself is constructed as a text-book for education classes, and has the merit of measuring well by the stand-

ard that it sets up. The book would be better entitled, "An Introduction to the Study of the Text-book," since it is the first in its field and is suggestive of so many possible lines of research. Investigations could, with profit, be carried on in any of the following suggestive fields: History of text-books, writing of text-books, supply of text-books, selection and judgment of text-books, and in the field of the use of text-books the opportunities are as numerous as educational science is broad.

We regret that the author is not more careful in giving credit where credit is due, and more thorough in investigating certain fields before he passes judgment on them. Moreover, indiscriminate quotation with no mention of the authority quoted is exceptionally vexing. However, quotations and illustrative extracts are abundant and help make the book interesting and profitable reading.

Pawtucket, R. I.

WAYNE E. DAVIS.

PAGE, RALPH W. *Dramatic Moments in American Diplomacy*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1918. Pp. 284. \$1.25.

As the title indicates, the author of this work does not attempt to give a connected account of American diplomatic history. Among the "dramatic moments" described are the making of the French Alliance in 1778, the negotiation of the Treaty of 1783, the purchase of Louisiana, the evolution of the Monroe Doctrine, the Trent affair, and the founding of the Republic of Panama.

As a whole, the book presents a curious compound of matter, good, bad and indifferent. Deserving commendation are pertinent excerpts from significant state papers, letters, and memoirs skillfully woven into the narrative. Extracts from the letters of Gouverneur Morris, the British demands in the Trent affair, John Hay's "Open Door" despatch, Roosevelt's comment on his policy towards Germany in the Venezuelan difficulty, are typical of such inclusions.

On the other hand, the constant tendency towards sensationalism by the use of extravagant and slangy expressions cheapens the book. For example, the Legislative Assembly of 1792 is "an assembly of lunatics," "the crazy mob" [of Paris] "hazed the distracted King," who "waved . . . his wooden sword, and cheered his tormentors." "In this most critical time of all French history," advice is sought of the American Minister; during the Terror he is the only foreign representative who remained in "the accursed city." After General Weyler started in "to clean the [Cuban] rebels up," the United States "assumed the role of the benevolent grandfather with the slipper." If, as it appears from the preface, the author attempted to write "in the language of the man on the street," he has been alarmingly successful.

The book is printed on poor paper and flimsily bound. It contains no index. It is not recommended for high school use.

HOWARD C. HILL.

University of Chicago High School.

MUHLON, WILHELM. *The Vandal of Europe*. Translation and Introduction by William L. McPherson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918. Pp. xvi, 335. \$1.50.

One would like to see such a volume as this reviewed a generation hence when criticism would have the advantage of perspective. This diary of a German industrial director deals with the opening of the war in such an anti-German spirit as to be astonishing. A director of Krupps, but a pacifist; one who says, "It is my task to hold before my eyes and those of my countrymen our own faults and weak-

nesses, and not the enemy's," yet has entree in the highest governmental circles—these are only samples of the extraordinary situation.

The tone from the outset is one that leads to the impression that the material was meant for publication. If so, its diary form adds little. Most of the important material does not refer particularly to the day on which it is written. It does not reflect any serious change of opinion with the passage of time. Hence the matter might have been more briefly and effectively presented in an organized treatise. As it stands, the diary form seems but a convenient excuse for haphazard and disjointed arrangement, and repetitiousness.

Every predilection of Herr Muhlön is anti-German. He repudiates the German idea of the State (p. 182 ff). He describes the Germans without mercy. "The outside world found Germans brutal when they pursued politics; hard-hearted when they were masters; unscrupulous when they conducted business; dull and ossified when they taught; awkward and unpolished wherever they appeared; without taste when they bought; ridiculous when they wanted to appear distinguished; cowardly when it came to individual convictions; not to be depended on when they should stand fast; servile when they wished to learn; unjust when they passed judgment on anything foreign." He ridicules the Kaiser and the Crown Prince, penetrates the falsity of German war bulletins and diplomatic utterances; proclaims the innocence and gallantry of Belgium, accepts the notion that the soldiers of the allies (even the Russians in East Prussia) were much better behaved than the German soldiery. Indeed, his predilections are so thoroughly anti-German that it destroys much of the value of the German source of the book. There is nothing German about it. It might well have been done by a neutral or a Frenchman. Muhlön himself says, "I am a stranger in Germany."

The translation is in idiomatic English. Almost no Germanisms remain. That is evidence, and there are others, that the translation is free; but there has not been opportunity to test its substantive accuracy.

HENRY M. WRISTON.

Wesleyan University.

TUFTS, JAMES H. *The Real Business of Living*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1918. Pp. v, 476. \$1.50.

Professor Tufts has taken on a large contract when he undertakes in a single volume to discuss the whole "business of living" and to go into the details on "doing one's work in the world." "This book attempts to show the origins of our institutions and standards, of our business and political ideals." "It also aims to point out the tasks in responsibility, public spirit, fair dealing, city planning, and further development of liberty, co-operation, and democracy which make the real business of living a genuine enterprise of high appeal." The book is intended to be used as a text for young people of high school grade.

The subject is divided into four parts, the beginnings of co-operation, order, and liberty; the problems of co-operation and right in business; the city and country; and liberty, union, and democracy in the new world. Part one traces from the days of the cave man the origin and growth of the state, law, social classes, ethical ideals, co-operation, and conceptions of liberty. Part two shows the growth of business methods and ideals from the days of the industrial revolution, and discusses the principles of business law and economic theory. In part three the growth of the city is developed, its accompanying problems discussed, and the city life is contrasted with country life showing the advantages and disadvantages of each. In the last part the au-

thor shows how America has taken the old world ideals of liberty, law, and government, and modified and developed them under a new environment. He concludes with an examination of the relations of the United States with other nations, and an inquiry into the righteousness of war. "Part I of this volume and, in more extended form, Part IV have appeared in a book for general readers entitled, 'Our Democracy.'"

The book is a combination of history, sociology, ethics, economics, commercial law, and political science. The ideals portrayed are admirable, and attempt to lift the material things to higher realms, but the subject is treated with an academic minuteness that makes the movement rather laborious and the reading often tiresome. Although at times the author has quoted copiously, he frequently fails to give authority or reference. On page 305 is described an investigation of immigrant wages and living conditions, but it does not tell us when or where it was made or where we may find out. To call education capital will not appeal to most economists. There is no bibliography.

In spite of the fact that the book was written in the heat of our participation in the World War, that two chapters are devoted to the relations of the United States with other nations and to the ethics of war, and that the book is an attempt to present the highest ideals of social, economic, and political justice, the greatest struggle for these ideals of all time is almost entirely ignored, only indirectly or by implication is reference made to it.

Professor Tufts' book would make an addition to a school reference library for use in classes in civics or ethics. It places emphasis upon a field that is too often neglected in the high school.

WM. H. HATHAWAY.

Riverside High School, Milwaukee, Wis.

TEGGART, FREDERICK J. *The Processes of History*. New York: Yale University Press, 1918. Pp. 162. \$1.25.

The author seeks to answer the question, *Is History a Science?* by presenting the results which might be obtained from applying strictly the methods of natural science to the facts of history. In his first chapter on "The Nature and Scope of the Inquiry," he defines the aims of the historian to be the discovery of the processes through which everywhere man has come to be what he is. He urges that "the narrative method hitherto relied upon by the historian sacrifices the wealth of concrete detail to the personal or speculative interest of individuals," and must be discarded for analytic processes that include in the material with which they deal great groups of historical data now ignored, such as annals or fasti of people not now recognized by the historian. On this worldwide material there should be employed by the historian those processes of investigation that scientists have developed, for astronomy, geology and biology are but forms of history. He then pursues an enquiry into the methods of the scientist, especially of the biologist, and seeks to show the applicability of his processes to the materials with which the historian should work. Proceeding then to a consideration of what these materials should be, that is, the nature of the evidence that should be used, he evaluates in two chapters first the geographical factor of history and then the human factor. In his concluding chapter he treats of "Methods and Results," and asserts that there should be a closer "mutual understanding and co-operation between the different specialties of humanistic study." "These studies, anthropology, history, geography, art, literature, religion, philology, politics and economics, are not independent sciences; they are aspects of the study

of man which have been pursued in comparative isolation because of the circumstances of their several origins, and because they have not been brought into relation by a common methodology." This is a stimulating and suggestive study, for the author has maintained well his thesis that history's horizon must be made broader and its processes more scientific.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912,

of THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK, published monthly, except July, August and September, at Philadelphia, Pa., for April 1, 1919.

State of Pennsylvania, } ss.
County of Philadelphia.

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally appeared Carl Litle, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the business manager of THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, MCKINLEY PUBLISHING Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Editor, ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
Managing Editor, ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
Business Manager, CARL LITTLE, Philadelphia, Pa.

2. That the owners are (give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent. or more of the total amount of stock).

ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
CHARLES S. MCKINLEY, Youngstown, O.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding one per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are (if there are none, so state).

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is.....

(This information is required from daily publications only.)

CARL LITTLE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29th day of March, 1919.
JULIA M. O'BRIEN.

CURRENT PERIODICAL ARTICLES ON THE TEACHING OF HISTORY.

LISTED BY W. L. HALL.

- Gathany, J. Madison. Weekly outline study of current history. *The Outlook*.
- Gerlough, L. S. The high school history lecture. *Education*, XXXIX (April, 1919), 481-483.
- Knowlton, Daniel C. Readers' guide and study outline. *Leslie's Weekly*.
- Lockwood, Ina. Suggestions for the history teacher; method in teaching history. *School Education*, XXXVIII (April, 1919), 22-25.
- The Ohio History Teachers' Journal*. (The Ohio State University Bulletin.)
- Aborn, Marjorie. Improvements in our recent textbooks in ancient history. XXII, Bul. No. 8 (January, 1918), 272-273.
- Ayer, J. Warren. The teaching of European history after the war. XXIII, Bul. No. 12 (January, 1919), 11-15.
- Dow, E. W. Principal weaknesses of freshmen in history with some consideration of the remedy. XXIII, Bul. No. 12 (January, 1919), 20-26.
- Gallen, Helen. Improvements in our recent textbooks in American history. XXII, Bul. No. 8 (January, 1918), 268-271.
- Harris, Wilmer C. English history and the war. XXII, Bul. No. 10 (May, 1918), 312-317.
- Hockett, Homer C. The world war and the teacher of American history. XII, Bul. No. 10 (May, 1918), 318-326.
- Hoover, Thomas G. The teaching of history in the high schools of Ohio. XXII, Bul. No. 8 (January, 1918), 266-267.
- Knipfing, John R. The world war and the teaching of ancient history. XXII, Bul. No. 9 (March, 1918), 295-304.
- Perkins, Clarence. How to connect medieval European history with the present war. XXII, Bul. No. 9 (March, 1918), 305-308.
- Shively, C. P. Reconstruction of the methods of teaching American history after the war. XXIII, Bul. No. 12 (January, 1919), 16-19.
- Stivers, Grace H. The ethical value of history. XXII, Bul. No. 8 (January, 1918), 263-265.

BOOKS ON HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES FROM FEBRUARY 22 TO MARCH 29, 1919.

LISTED BY CHARLES A. COULOMB, PH.D.

AMERICAN HISTORY.

- Abbott, Wilbur C. Col. John Scott, of Long Island, 1634(?) - 1696. New Haven, Ct.: Yale Univ. 93 pp. \$1.25.
- Felter, William L. Historic Green Point [Brooklyn]. Brooklyn, N. Y.: Green Point Savings Bank, 807 Manhattan Ave. 61 pp.
- Fossum, Andrew. The Norse discovery of America. Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. Ho. 160 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Johnson, Allen, editor. The chronicles of America [second ten volumes]. New Haven, Ct.: Yale Univ. Set of 50 vols. \$175.00.
- Kruszka, Wenceslaus. *Historia Polika w Ameryce* [History of the Polish in America], in 13 vols. Milwaukee, Wis.: C. N. Caspar Co. 60 cents each.
- O'Brien, Michael J. A hidden phase of American history; Ireland's part in America's struggles for liberty. N. Y.: Devin-Adair Co. 533 pp. \$5.00, net.

Roy, Pierre-Georges. *Sieur de Vincennes identified*. Indianapolis: Ind. Hist. Soc. 130 pp. (2½ pp. bibls.). 50 cents.

Waters, Thomas F. *Ipswich in the Massachusetts Bay Colony*. Vol. 2. Ipswich, Mass.: Ipswich Hist. Soc. 839 pp. \$6.00.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

Petrie, W. M. Flinders. *Eastern exploration, past and future*. N. Y.: McBride. 118 pp. \$1.00, net.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

- Quennell, Marjorie, and Quennell, C. H. B. *A history of everyday things in English*. [History of customs and occupations of the English people from 1066-1499.] N. Y.: Scribner. 207 pp. \$4.00, net.
- Tidball, Thomas A. *The making of the Church of England*. (A.D. 597-1087.) Boston: Stratford Co. 227 pp. \$2.00.

EUROPEAN HISTORY.

- Anderson, Frank M., and Hershey, Amos S. *Handbook for the diplomatic history of Europe, Asia, and Africa, 1870-1914*. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 482 pp. (bibls.).
- Barrows, Charles H. *Alsace-Lorraine*. Springfield, Mass.: F. A. Bassette Co. 34 pp. Privately printed.
- Bates, Jean V. *Our allies and enemies in the Near East*. N. Y.: Dutton. 226 pp. \$5.00.
- Benson, Edward F. *The white eagle of Poland*. N. Y.: Doran. 255 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Cerf, Barry. *Alsace-Lorraine since 1870*. N. Y.: Macmillan. 190 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Egan, Maurice F. *Ten years near the German frontier*. [Account of Prussian policy and activity in Denmark.] N. Y.: Doran. 364 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Higby, Chester P. *The religious policy of the Bavarian government during the Napoleonic period*. N. Y.: Longmans. 346 pp. \$3.00, special net.
- Levine, Isaac Don. *The resurrected nations*. N. Y.: Stokes. 309 pp. \$1.60, net.
- Long, Robert E. C. *Russian revolution aspects*. N. Y.: Dutton. 294 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Radziwill, Catherine, Princess. *The fire brand of Bolshevism*. Boston: Small Maynard. 293 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Russian (The) *Constitution, adopted July 10, 1918*. N. Y.: Nation Press. 20 pp. 5 cents.
- Russian (The) *Land Law*. N. Y.: Nation Press. 16 pp. 5 cents.
- Seton-Watson, Robert W. *The rise of nationality in the Balkans*. N. Y.: Dutton. 308 pp. (10 pp. bibls.). \$5.00, net.
- Wilton, Robert. *Russia's Agony*. N. Y.: Dutton. 357 pp. \$5.00, net.

THE GREAT WAR.

- After war trade plans of five nations; Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Germany*. N. Y.: N. Y. Eve. Post. 22 pp. 25 cents.
- Barron, Clarence W. *War finance*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin. 368 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Buchan, John. *Nelson's History of the War*. Vol. 19, spring campaigns of 1917. Vol. 20, summer campaigns of 1917. Vol. 21, the fourth winter of war. N. Y.: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 295, 299, 390 pp. Vols. 19 and 20, each 60 cents, net. Vol. 21, \$1.00, net.
- C——, Feldwebel. *The diary of a German soldier*. N. Y.: A. Knopf. 251 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Dawson, Coningsby W. *Living bayonets; a record of the last push*. N. Y.: John Lane. 221 pp. \$1.25, net.
- Dutcher, George M. *A selected critical bibliography of publications in English relating to the world war*. Phila.: McKinley Pub. Co., 1621 Ranstead St. 36 pp. 25 cents.
- Earnest, William W. *A war catechism; questions and answers concerning the great world war*. Champaign, Ill.: W. W. Earnest. 48 pp. 20 cents.

- Ferrara, Oreste. Lessons of the war and the peace conference. N. Y.: Harper. 252 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Geiser, Karl F. Democracy vs. Autocracy; a comparative study of governments in the World War. N. Y.: Heath. 94 pp. 60 cents.
- General von Bissing's statement. N. Y.: Harper. 25 cents, net.
- Gompers, Samuel. American labor and the war. N. Y.: Doran. 377 pp. \$1.75, net.
- Hobbs, William H. The world war and its consequences. N. Y.: Putnam. 446 pp. (bibls.). \$2.50, net.
- Jenks, Chester W. Our first ten-thousand. Boston: Four Seas. 144 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Kniper, B. K. De Groote oorlog; geschiedenis van de Groote Europeesche oorlog van 1914-1918. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans-Sevensma Co. 400 pp. \$2.00.
- March, Francis A., and Beamish, R. J. History of the World War. Phila.: Winston. 736 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Marcosson, Isaac F. America's miracle in France S. O. S. N. Y.: John Lane. \$1.50, net.
- Natl. Board for Historical Service. Peace and Reconstruction: preliminary bibliography. Boston: World Peace Foundation. 32 pp.
- National Industrial Conference Board. Problems of Industrial readjustments in the United States. Boston: Natl. Industries Conf. Board. 58 pp. \$1.00.
- Natl. Industries Conference Board. Wartime changes in the cost of living, July, 1914-November, 1918. Boston: Natl. Industries Conf. Board. 33 pp. \$1.00.
- Newbolt, Sir Henry J. Submarine and anti-submarine. N. Y.: Longmans. 312 pp. \$2.25, net.
- Persecutions of the Greeks in Turkey since the beginning of the European War. N. Y.: Am.-Hellenic Soc. 72 pp. 50 cents.
- Rogers, Lindsay, editor. The problems of reconstruction. N. Y.: Am. Assn. for Internat. Concil. 167 pp. (2¾ pp. bibls.).
- Rolt-Wheeler, F. W., and Drinker, F. E., editors. The world war for liberty. [History of the great war.] Phil.: Natl. Pub. Co. 551 pp. \$3.75.
- Simonds, Frank H. History of the world war. Vol. 3, Verdun and the Somme. N. Y.: Doubleday, Page. 346 pp. \$4.00, net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

- American (the) Year Book. N. Y.: Appleton. 850 pp. \$3.50, net.
- Gasca, Pedro de la. Some unpublished letters relating to the conquest of Peru. Worcester, Mass.: Am. Antiq. Soc. 24 pp. 50 cents.
- Japan (the) Year Book. N. Y.: Dixie Book Shop. 785 pp. \$5.00.
- Olmstead, Albert T. New Arab kingdom and the fate of the Muslim world. Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Ill. 12 pp. 10 cents.
- Sweet, W. W. A history of Latin America. N. Y.: Abingdon Press. 283 pp. (bibls.). \$3.00, net.
- Walker, Alice Johnstone. La Fayette; Christopher Columbus; The Long Knives in Illinois; brief plays for the young. N. Y.: Holt. 252 pp. \$1.35, net.
- Wheeler, W. Reginald. China and the world war. N. Y.: Macmillan. 263 pp. (5 pp. bibls.). \$1.75, net.
- Who's who, 1919. N. Y.: Macmillan. 2727 pp. \$12.00, net.

BIOGRAPHY.

- Lees, Beatrice A. Alfred the Great. N. Y.: Putnam. 493 pp. (3 pp. bibls.). \$1.90, net.
- Robertson, Charles G. Bismarck. N. Y.: Holt. 539 pp. (6 pp. bibls.). \$2.25, net.
- Hyndman, Henry M. Clemenceau; the man and his time. N. Y.: Stokes. 338 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Hobson, John A. Richard Cobden. N. Y.: Holt. 413 pp. \$5.00, net.
- Atteridge, Andrew H. Marshal Ferdinand Foch. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead. 286 pp. \$2.50.
- Plunket, Irene. Isabel of Castile, 1451-1504. N. Y.: Putnam. 432 pp. \$1.90, net.

- Parkman, Mary R. Fighters for peace. [Biographies of soldiers and statesmen who have become famous during the war.] N. Y.: Century Co. 311 pp. \$1.50.
- Washington, George. The agricultural papers of George Washington. Boston: Badger. 145 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Archer, William. The peace-president; a brief appreciation. [English estimate of President Wilson.] N. Y.: Holt. 123 pp. \$1.00, net.

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS.

- Adams, George B. The British Empire and a league of peace. N. Y.: Putnam. 21 pp.
- Ames, Edgar W. New York State government. N. Y.: Macmillan. 73 pp. 24 cents, net.
- Barnard, J. L., and Evans, J. C. Citizenship in Philadelphia. Phila.: J. C. Winston Co. 376 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Chang, Tso-Shuen. History and analysis of the commission and city manager plans of municipal government in the United States. Iowa City, Ia.: Univ. of Ia. 290 pp. \$2.50.
- Corbett, Sir Julian S. The league of nations and freedom of the seas. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 15 pp. 12 cents.
- Hamilton, Sir Ian S. M. The millennium. [Reflections on British Imperialism and the League of Nations.] N. Y.: Longmans. 156 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Lawrence, Thomas J. The society of nations; its past, present, and possible future. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 194 pp. \$1.50, net.
- Los Angeles Library School. Americanization [bibliography]. Los Angeles, Cal.: Los Angeles Pub. Lib. 24 pp.
- McLaughlin, Andrew C. America and Britain. N. Y.: Dutton. 221 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Munro, William B. The government of the United States. N. Y.: Macmillan. 648 pp. \$2.75, net.
- Myers, William S. Socialism and American Ideals. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press. 100 pp. \$1.00, net.
- "Neutrality" (the) of the Pope condemned by Christian doctrine; by a Belgian Roman Catholic. Los Angeles, Cal.: Justitia Pub. Co. 31 pp. 20 cents.
- Robertson, Archibald T. The New Citizenship. N. Y.: Revell. 157 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Scott, James B. James Madison's notes of debates in the Federal convention of 1787 and their relation to a more perfect society of nations. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 149 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Smuts, Jan Christian. The league of nations; a practical suggestion. N. Y.: Nation Press. 64 pp. 15 cents.

HISTORICAL ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS, MARCH TO APRIL, 1919.

COMPILED BY LEO F. STOCK.

A select list of the articles of historical value appearing in the current issues of American and British periodicals:

EUROPE, GENERAL, MISCELLANEOUS.

- European Theories of Constitutional Government After the Congress of Vienna. William A. Dunning (*Political Science Quarterly*, March).
- After Napoleon and After Wilhelm II. Wilbur C. Abbott (*Unpopular Review*, April-June).
- The Converging Democracies. W. E. Dodd (*Yale Review*, April). Britain and America.
- The Anglo-Norman Renaissance. J. E. G. Montmorency (*Edinburgh Review*, January).
- Food Control and Price-Fixing in Revolutionary France, II. Henry E. Bourne (*Journal of Political Economy*, March).
- Germany's Debt to France. G. P. Gooch (*Quarterly Review*, January).
- The Prussian Peasantry before 1807. Guy S. Ford (*American Historical Review*, April).

German Colonial Administration. Evans Lewin (*Atlantic Monthly*, April).

Kings of Jerusalem. Frederick Cunliffe-Owen (*Munsey's*, April).

THE GREAT WAR AND ITS PROBLEMS.

The Roots of the War, IX. William S. Davis, in collaboration with William Anderson and Mason W. Tyler (*Century*, April).

The Strategy on the Western Front, III. Lieut.-Col. H. H. Sargent (*North American Review*, April).

How the War Was Won. Gen. Malletterre (*Harper's*, April). Translated by Herbert Adams Gibbons.

Nurse Cavell: The Story of Her Trial Told by One of the Condemned. G. Hostelet (*Nineteenth Century and After*, March).

The Devastation of Northern France. Germain Martin (*Atlantic Monthly*, April).

Redrawing the Map of Europe. C. D. Hazen (*Atlantic Monthly*, April).

Alsace-Lorraine. J. R. Moreton Macdonald (*Quarterly Review*, January).

Belgium, Luxembourg and Limbourg. G. W. T. Omond (*Nineteenth Century and After*, March).

The Frontiers of Belgium. Emile Cammaerts (*Edinburgh Review*, January).

The Full Freedom of the Scheldt. Signed "Y" (*Fortnightly Review*, March).

The Macedonian Question. H. Charles Woods (*Fortnightly Review*, March).

The Ukraine. O. de L. (*Edinburgh Review*, January).

Jugo-Slavia the New Nation. C. D. Hazen (*Red Cross Magazine*, April).

BRITISH EMPIRE.

Queen Elizabeth's Visit to Tilbury in 1588. Miller Christy (*English Historical Review*, January).

St. Wilfred and the See of Ripon. R. L. Poole (*English Historical Review*, January).

The First Canadian Agent in London. W. S. Wallace (*Canadian Magazine*, April). Concerning Fowler Walker, who was appointed by the merchants of Quebec and Montreal, in 1765, to represent them in London.

Early Paper Currency in Australia. F. Gardner (*Victorian Historical Magazine*, January).

Further Scraps of Early Melbourne History. Thomas O'Callaghan (*Victorian Historical Magazine*, January).

The Company of Royal Adventurers Trading into Africa. George F. Zook (*Journal of Negro History*, April).

The Claims of Afghanistan. Ikbal Ali Shah (*Edinburgh Review*, January).

UNITED STATES.

(In approximate chronological order.)

A New Interpretation of the Beginnings of American History. Matthew P. Andrews (*Educational Foundations*, March).

The First Europeans in Texas, 1528-1536, II. Harbert Davenport and Joseph K. Wells (*Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, January).

Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the Spanish Colonies. Rev. Edwin A. Ryan (*Catholic Historical Review*, April). California, New Mexico, Arizona, Texas.

New Orleans. W. O. Hart (*Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, April, 1918). Historical sketch.

Four Revolutions and Virginia Education. A. J. Morrison (*Texas Review*, January).

The Story of Wisconsin, 1634-1848. Louise P. Kellog (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, March).

A Lost Utopia of the First American Frontier. Verner W. Crane (*Sewanee Review*, January-March). The story of Priber in the Cherokee country.

The Southern Frontier in Queen Anne's War. Verner W. Crane (*American Historical Review*, April).

The American Revolution Reconsidered. Arthur M. Schlesinger (*Political Science Quarterly*, March).

Life of Thomas Johnson. Edward S. Delaplaine (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, March).

Washington's Foreign Policy. William E. Borah (*D. A. R. Magazine*, April).

The Old Chicago Trail and the Old Chicago Road. Elmore Barce (*Indiana Magazine of History*, March).

Gen. Collet's Reconnoitering Trip Down the Mississippi, 1796. Heloise H. Cruzat (*Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, April, 1918).

Historic Turnpike Roads and Toll-Gates. Maj. Fred J. Wood (*D. A. R. Magazine*, April). Continued since the January number.

The Admission of Louisiana into the Union. Lillie Richardson (*Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, April, 1918).

Virginia Works and Days, 1814-1819. A. J. Morrison (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, January).

The Last Stage of Texan Military Operations Against Mexico. William C. Binkley (*Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, January).

Militia of the United States from 1846 to 1860. Paul T. Smith (*Indiana Magazine of History*, March).

Diverging Tendencies in New York Democracy in the Period of the Locofocos. William Trimble (*American Historical Review*, April).

Some Account of Steam Navigation in New England (continued). Francis B. C. Bradlee (*Essex Institute Historical Collections*, April).

American Occupation of Iowa (1833-1860). Cardinal Goodwin (*Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, January).

The Speaker of the House of Representatives in Iowa. Cyril B. Upham (*Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, January).

Federal Politics in North Carolina (1824-1836). William K. Boyd (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, January).

Early Railroading in Kentucky. R. S. Cotterill (*Register of Kentucky State Historical Society*, January).

South Carolina and the South on the Eve of Secession, 1852-1860. Chauncey S. Boucher (*Washington University Studies*, April).

Passage of the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment through Baltimore, April 19, 1861. Matthew P. Andrews (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, March).

The Confederate Campaign in Kentucky: The Battle of Perryville. A. C. Quisenbury (*Register of Kentucky State Historical Society*, January).

Back to Peace in 1865. Carl R. Fish (*American Historical Review*, April).

Looking Backward. Henry Watterson (*Saturday Evening Post*, March 1 to April 19). Reminiscences, political, social, and biographical.

The Populist Party in Indiana (concluded). Ernest D. Stewart (*Indiana Magazine of History*, March).

The Life of General Pershing. V. George MacAdam (*World's Work*, April).

Early Efforts in Both Americas Towards the Establishment of a League of Nations. F. Tudela Varela (*Pan-American Magazine*, April).

Immigration and the Labor Supply. Don D. Lescossier (*Atlantic Monthly*, April).

Preliminary Report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in Schools

THE ELEMENTARY AND GRAMMAR GRADES.

The Suggested Course in History, Correlated with Civics, Geography, and Reading.

The Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools, which was appointed by the American Historical Association and the National Board for Historical Service, in co-operation with the Commission on a National Program for Education of the National Education Association, has now had in hand the work assigned to it for the space of about three months. The labors of the committee, however, are only well begun. The secretary and the chairman have been actively engaged in collecting and comparing the views of history teachers, superintendents, principals and others who are interested in the solution of the history teaching problem. Other members of the committee, also, are at work on particular phases of the general study. But it will be some time yet before all branches of the inquiry shall have been sifted with the requisite thoroughness so that the committee as a whole can act definitively in recommending a course of study for the high school, the graded school, the normal school, the vocational school, the rural school, and the Americanization programs.

It is felt, however, that the safest way to proceed is to take the history teachers of the country as fully into the confidence of the committee as it is possible to do. To this end, every opportunity for holding conferences with groups of history teachers, or with groups of other teachers and superintendents interested in the administration of the history course, has been taken advantage of by the members of the committee for the purposes of close and sympathetic consultation. In this way exceedingly valuable suggestions, based upon the experience of history teachers in the high schools and upon the experience of superintendents, supervisors and teachers in the grades have already come to the committee from time to time. It is believed that a wider conference is possible through the publication in *THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK* of suggested changes that are being considered by individual members of the committee for presentation later to the full committee. Such publication in advance will enable all history teachers to contribute criticisms and suggestions which, at the time of the plenary meeting of the committee, can be carefully considered and acted upon.

At the present time, the chairman and secretary of the committee are engaged in the task of making such suggested changes in the course of study for graded schools as will render that course more nearly adequate to the altered situation as respects history and education for citizenship due to the events of the

past few years, since the valuable report of the Committee of Eight was adopted and published.¹ The principal new elements in our department of instruction, if history and civics are to meet the requirements which an intelligent public demands, should be (a) to secure a higher degree of intelligence in regard to world affairs as distinguished from purely American affairs; and (b) a deeper, more fundamental appreciation of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship regarded both in its moral and its intellectual aspects. Accordingly, if some means could be found, through desirable correlations, whereby more time could be devoted to the social studies than formerly; if, in the distribution of time, not less but rather more emphasis should be placed upon American history and American social and political conditions, while at the same time interest is aroused and knowledge imparted that will put the pupil ultimately in rapport with the affairs of the world at large, that we believe is the general result which the committee will be expected to secure.

Without further introduction, we now pass to a discussion of the principles which, as we believe, should determine the nature of the work to be offered in each of the grades. At the close of the discussion we shall append a skeleton outline of the suggested course.

FIRST GRADE AND SECOND GRADE.

In these earliest school years it seems wisest not to attempt to differentiate history from other matter of literary instruction. It is the child's time to learn the great artificial and supplementary process of acquiring knowledge through reading. And, while the material of instruction is not a matter of indifference, so far as its bearing on the later history work is concerned, yet that material must nevertheless be chosen with great freedom, on pedagogical grounds, by those who are responsible for teaching children to read and the history interest will be fully satisfied if the results are *good from the reading point of view*.

That is to say, if in the first two years the child shall acquire the power (1) to interpret freely thought which is simply and plainly expressed in familiar words, in print; (2) to reproduce with accuracy in his own language, the substance of what he reads; (3) to remember, with such distinctness as to be able to formulate it at any time, the *essential significant fact* of a story or description; (4) to state accurately facts of observation or of oral report which he desires to contribute to the class discussion of reading matter, he will have secured good training for later history work.

¹ Other members of the committee have in hand similar studies, but their results are not yet ready to publish.

No doubt the teacher of reading will aim to develop, through the matter selected, the imaginations of the children. For this purpose there is a wide range of material to select from, and a portion of this is apt to have a certain relation to history. Mythological stories have always been a favorite means of stimulating children's imaginations. Such stories are abundant. They are not history and should not be given as history. But, if carefully selected, they may prove of great intellectual value to the child. Their value to history lies chiefly in giving the child mystical interest in peoples, like the ancient Greeks, with whom history brings him in contact later. To some extent, also, the myths and fables learned in early childhood surprise the pupil agreeably later on by re-appearing in the content of the life and literature of many races in many lands. This would not be true of Indian myths which, in some quarters, it is desired to substitute for the folk myths of the ancient world. In the interest of sound pedagogy it would seem wise to select most of the myths at least from the ancients. A few nature myths, valuable as opening the minds of children to natural science subjects, could well be taken from collections of Indian stories.

As we deem it undesirable to stake any exclusive claims in this field—the first two grades—for history, so, also, we cannot bring ourselves to urge any very definite or detailed plan for teaching elementary civics to tots of six and seven years of age. We do hold, however, to the pedagogical soundness of the plan of instruction which draws upon the child's experience for all sorts of appropriate illustrative material; which makes familiar things the starting points in discussions that may lead into distant fields; and which brings the child mind back, after exciting imaginative flights, to rest in the familiar friendly environment of home.

The danger one would fear in outlining for these years a rigorous course of lessons on *the home, the farm, the store, the factory*, etc., is that, if used unskilfully, it would favor a tendency to make the child prematurely introspective and "careful about many things," at a time when nature prompts the mind to range widely and freely amid strange scenes, personages, and ideas. Not to be pedantic about marking off psychological stages too sharply it is nevertheless a matter of common observation that in these years the imaginative activity of the child is predominant, and it would seem a great pity to warp the child's normal development through an impatient insistence on the learning of family, community, and civic duties—especially when such a plan would obviously defeat its own purposes, since the only man who can be a truly good citizen is the man of normal, not abnormal, development.

It is assumed that the teachers of reading will not miss any natural opportunity to emphasize ideas illustrative of family, social or civic virtues, or to clarify and deepen the child's tendency to observe accurately the things of the home, farm, school and neighborhood. As a kind of starting point for geographical excursions, a considerable variety of social and eco-

nomic facts can be brought up in the minds of pupils incidentally and without strain. It would be a happy circumstance if the reading books were so organized as to enable enough of these materials to be brought in by way of discussion of the lessons read.

Questions.

1. Are we right in assuming that the main work of the first two school years is to teach the child to read?
2. Should historical material be drawn upon to any extent in training the child to read?
3. Must the reading matter also be so diversified as to provide contacts with a wide variety of facts and ideas which are other than historical?
4. Are we right in saying that this is the age when imagination dominates the child interest?
5. If many children are found to be more interested in every-day things of their environment than in things of the imagination, would that be a reason for concentrating their attention upon homely things or would it rather be a reason for making homely things the starting point in excursions that reach far afield?
6. Is it sound pedagogy to refuse to adopt a rigorous course of home and community exercises for the first two years?
7. Is it sound pedagogy to correlate with reading all work of a historical or geographical or civic nature which is to be given to children of these grades?
8. Are there reading books which adequately provide for the work of the first and second grades as above indicated?

THE WORK AFTER THE SECOND GRADE.

General Comment.

The theory of the arrangement of material herewith presented, from the third grade to the eighth grade, is as follows:

(a) Different fields of history which ought to come under the child's survey, afford differing values from the standpoint of supplying facts and principles interpretative of the world's existing social order. Accordingly, the fields lend themselves to treatments which vary in thoroughness or intensity.

(b) Since the general circumstance which conditions thoroughness of treatment is the capacity of the learner, it follows that, in a very real sense, the grades of the school are the basis for graduating the fields with reference to the treatment which is desirable.

For example, if we are convinced that certain elementary things about the ancient or classic world, stories of its leading heroes and statesmen or other picturesque and significant characters, interesting bits of description relative to the life of the people and all those elements of civilization which history carries forward into the later world, would supply an adequate background for the child upon which to project the modern world, then we might readily decide that such a study of the classic world is possible to the child of nine or ten years of age. On the other hand, if we are convinced that every American citizen

should know the history of his own country, not merely in its story or dramatic aspects, but with respect also to its institutional development, and the major aspects of the present day organization conditioning the duties of citizens, then it is easy to conclude that such a study cannot be made prior to the last two years of the graded school course. In other words, the fields of history themselves will constitute a series of steps; more accurately a series of inclines, leading gradually up from that point where the child's capacity is limited to the apprehension of only the simplest facts and principles presented in dramatic form, to the point where his mental grasp is relatively mature, permitting of a measure of discriminating reflection.

Some will doubtless disagree with the idea that the above considerations suggest an arrangement of the historical fields which on the whole harmonize chronology with the psychological development of children. It will be pointed out, for example, that chronological nearness to the present does not determine in all cases the nearness in interest of the subject under consideration. In particular, there will be objection to the idea of treating Greek and Roman history as early as the fourth grade. And there will also be objection to the apparent neglect of American story history in the earlier grades.

Both of these objections, as we believe, can be met. For, while it is true that Greek history and Roman history are more like our own than is the history of the period intervening between the ancient and the modern, still it is also true that apart from a galaxy of brilliant biographical stories, readily absorbed by young children, and such a treatment of the elements of classic civilization as will help to explain the later evolution of modern life—a treatment which can readily be made available for the instruction of young children—there is not very much in classic history that could in any circumstances be given to children under high school age. Under the several sections of this paper dealing with particular grades, will be found suggestions respecting treatment of subject-matter which will prove that we have no desire to exclude material relating to America. On the contrary, we are firm in the conviction that appropriate matter drawn from the environment of the pupils and from biographical stories relating to American life should be used constantly from the first grade to the end of the course as an important feature of the program of instruction. Not less American material, but more, is what we desire and what, with the economies effected through correlations, we think this arrangement will secure at the same time that it enables our grade pupils to acquire a much more adequate and systematic introduction to the life history of the western world, including all of Europe.

THE THIRD GRADE.

The first systematic history work which we suggest is in the third year of school. It includes, as reading matter to be pursued regularly in class, stories of early man and also stories of the pre-Greek world, especially Egypt and Palestine.

Since there are books which contain stories of early man (for example, the Cave Man Series) that are now used very successfully in the reading work of the third grade; and since, both chronologically and logically, some ideas concerning early man ought to be imparted to the child as a basis for the study of civilized man, it is thought justifiable to begin the history course with stories of primitive man.

This work will have to be exceedingly elementary, and will not in any sense take the place of a course in anthropology, which, on many grounds, is deemed to be desirable at a much later point in the history course. The course in elementary anthropology has as its end to indoctrinate the child with a definite sense of human evolution. This the elementary work suggested for the third grade will not accomplish. It will, however, furnish a background of images, facts, and ideas which the pupil can be led to relate to his later history work, and which, at the moment of presentation, may be effectively used as a means of sharpening his power to observe elements of his immediate social and physical environment. It will make a good approach to such elementary ideas in civics as can be successfully imparted to the child mind.

The story of the cave men, for example, is a fascinating drama, staged in a mysterious attractive wilderness affording to human beings only the most primitive and precarious refuge against savage and dangerous beasts. The struggles of the human clan, in this environment, lead to the improvement of primitive weapons, necessitate the closest co-operation in defense and attack, and produce life-transforming inventions like the discovery of the ways of starting fire, which are handed on from generation to generation as a part of the sacred heritage of the people.

These things develop the civic attitude of mind. Moreover, there are many specific applications to the present which the good teacher is sure to make, for the sake of illustrating and driving home the stories read. Success through co-operation is illustrated on the world theatre by the recent war just as the cave man illustrates it in his war against Saber-Tooth. The community fire, guarded and kept burning by a specially appointed member of the family, has its analogy in modern municipal power and lighting plants. The inventions of the twirl stick method of lighting the fire suggests questions as to the modes of starting fire which were in use by the early American settlers, or our ancestors during the American Revolution; also questions as to how the fires were preserved in the hearths and how they were rekindled when accidentally extinguished. When the child shall have learned how recently friction matches were invented, and how primitive were the modes of starting and of preserving fires before that invention, he will have one of the facts of human history which are best calculated to arouse in him the impulse of wonder so necessary to the finest development of mind. It goes without saying that much could be made in this connection of the marvelous developments in lighting which have come within the memory of men

still living, through progress in the study of electricity.

The second element in the suggested program for the third grade is stories of the pre-Greek world. Some of the Bible stories for children may prove available here, also some of the dramatic representations of life in Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Phœnicia, etc. The aim in all cases should be to convey to the child vivid impressions of things in the most ancient civilizations which are worth remembering because of their relation to what he is to learn later, or because of their moral or civic value.

The question of the selection of topics is all important. Writers of children's books have demonstrated their ability to treat a wide variety of material in ways suitable for any given grade. It is merely requisite that, in their final report, the committee should indicate the nature of the material which ought to be given, and private initiative can be depended upon to produce books embodying it, if proper ones do not now exist. It is clear that, since those stories are to follow directly after the story of the cave men, a special effort should be made to impress those fundamental improvements, like knowledge of the working of iron, of the arts of computation, and of writing, of building, husbandry, transportation and communication, and war.

In connection with the Hebrews, and to some extent with the Egyptians, Persians and others, moral and civic ideas can be impressed with great success. Biography, of course, is the main element of the work, but in treating the biographies it is the aim to develop the life surroundings more adequately than often has been the case.

FOURTH GRADE.

For the fourth year we propose (1) stories of Greece and how the Greeks lived; and (2) stories of Rome and how the Romans lived. Supplementary material in the nature of hero tales of both Greece and Rome can be found in desirable forms, frequently in the best literature of the ancient world.

We have already discussed some of the reasons for taking up the classical period early. The child is engaged in learning, from all sources, about the social world in which he lives. He is reading stories, hearing tales, memorizing poems, and getting the meanings of new words from day to day. For the successful performance of this process of unlocking the varied mysteries of social life he requires a variety of keys. Among them, one of the most generally serviceable will be a speaking acquaintance with the life of the classic world; because that life has interpenetrated all life among western peoples.

For many years teachers and text-book writers have professed a belief that the elements of classical history which were important for the child to-day were those features which might be described as the history of civilization in Greece and Rome. Yet, the most cursory examination of the text-books used as guides in the ancient history course as usually given will disclose the fact that almost without exception

the stress is laid upon military and political history. There are indeed paragraphs or sections of the text-books devoted to art, architecture, etc. These sections are almost invariably presented in the most formal and formidable manner, and often printed in smaller type than the regular narrative. In a word, the elements of Greek and Roman civilization, as material for the interpretation of the modern world, have not commonly been presented in the history course. The classic tradition, the superior accessibility of material of the other sorts, the appeal of the grand narrative, have proved too strong for writers to resist. We have therefore gone on from generation to generation teaching those things which interested the Greeks themselves and the Romans in the narratives of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Livy and Tacitus.

Indisputably the time has come for a very considerable revision of our practice in this respect. The results hitherto obtained from the study of Greek and Roman history as a definite first year high school course have not been commensurate with the effort expended. One reason for this, as teachers will testify, is found in the circumstance that children have been permitted to range through eight years of school, reading a wide variety of literary selections, studying history, geography, and so forth without having been given a preliminary acquaintance with the elements of classical life; so that when they come to their high school years, in a frame of mind already assuming the practical cast, the difficulties of nomenclature, and the general remoteness and inapplicability of the historical material leaves them quite indifferent to its significance. They are apt to feel that they are wasting time. True, it has been argued that Greek and Roman history is especially valuable because of its detachment, so that it can be studied as calmly as mathematics. But for the high school boy and girl the study of history is valuable especially for its moral and ethical training, in addition to the information imparted, and for moral and ethical training history must function in the life which is significant to the child. An examination of some of the delightful story readers, treating both of heroes and leaders in the ancient world and of characteristic elements in classical life, convinces us that it will be possible to impart, in elementary form, a wide range of ideas and facts about that world to children as immature as those in the fourth grade. We believe it is advantageous to undertake this work in the fourth year because of the romantic interest of the child in that age, and of the importance of furnishing his mind, through the suggested contrasts with antiquity, with an invaluable means of interpreting all kinds of study material to be presented later in his school career. In both branches of our suggested courses, the strictly biographical stories and the stories descriptive of life, customs, etc., we desire to emphasize the pedagogical importance of illustrating by reference to the corresponding facts of the child's environment. Plutarch, the distinguished Greek biographer, followed a wise pedagogical principle when he wrote his "Parallel

Lives" of Roman and Greek heroes and leaders. By a somewhat similar process, which can and should be indicated with some detail in the final report, American teachers could readily present a series of brief American biographies, to parallel the stories of men of old. Cincinnatus and Washington, with emphasis upon their readiness to take up the sword at their country's call, and their longing to return to the peaceful arts of husbandry; Tiberius, Gracchus and Theodore Roosevelt as guardians of the people's heritage of natural resources; Demosthenes and Webster as orators; Pericles and Lincoln as wise statesmen; in great crises: Alexander and Napoleon as conquerors; Cato and Franklin as preachers of economy and thrift—these are only illustrations; the list can be easily lengthened and certainly improved.

In this way will the knowledge of American men (and men of other modern countries, particularly great leaders of the recent war, could be used also) be acquired under a stimulus which will make the information vital, while at the same time much useful interpretative material will be carried over from the ancient world. And on the features of classical life and civilization the same pedagogical comment should be made. A Greek temple in itself will mean very little to the average ten-year-old child. But a picture of the Greek temple placed alongside of a picture of the Lincoln memorial in Washington will suggest the transmission of culture from the ancients to the moderns. Through exercises in drawing, in clay modeling, and in picture work many thoroughly sound and permanently serviceable ideas can be fixed in the child's mind with reference to Greek architecture, Roman architecture, other forms of art, useful arts like Roman road building, the construction of arches, and tunnels, the Roman post, Greek and Roman ships and commerce, the elements of home life, its comforts and luxuries, tools and processes of husbandry. Mental growth in children depends upon the thrills of recognition which signalize the assimilation of new knowledge. A careful and so far as possible dramatic, or biographical presentation, of leading elements in the life of the Greeks and Romans, especially such features of it as may be imparted naturally in narratives exemplifying primarily the social and civic virtues of great characters, will serve again, on a higher plane, to stimulate the child to make a discriminating analysis of both human and physical elements in his own immediate surroundings. Such instruction is in its very nature civic and moral. There exists among many wise teachers a conviction that the background for civics instruction should be laid partly in biography. To the child, civic virtues are those which are exemplified by his heroes. So that our history is serving the great practical end of training for citizenship at the same time that it is building up the mental life of the child with reference to the interpretation of the world in an ever larger way.

While we recognize the desirability of including in the reading course a good deal of matter relating to nature work we hold nevertheless to the view that a goodly share of the time now often devoted to general

subjects should be given definitely to history. The history books will be reading books.

It is hardly necessary to point out that, just as this work correlates perfectly with civics and with reading, so also should it be correlated with geography. Teachers will hardly question the statement that places gain significance to children in proportion as they come to be related to interesting human personages. In the stories of the Greeks and Romans are to be found several wonderful travelogues. One need but mention the wanderings of Ulysses, the exiled Aeneas, Jason and the search for the Golden Fleece, the march of the Ten Thousand Greeks, the marvelous stories of Alexander's conquests, Hannibal's invasion of Italy, Cæsar in Gaul, Germany and Britain, the Roman Military and Naval patrol of the Rhine and the Danube. By connecting with such stories map studies and other devices for fixing geographical facts, a peculiarly effective treatment of geography as conceived by the ancient world can be given. In the next grade the child will advance from a conception of the world as centering about the Mediterranean Sea to a new conception that it centers upon the Atlantic Ocean. This, we submit, is the natural way in which to teach world geography, and it is significant that some of the most authoritative recent courses are constructed on this principle.

THE FIFTH AND SIXTH GRADES.

These two years should be laying broad yet definite foundations for the study of the American nation. To this study there are two approaches, not one, as has been sometimes maintained. In the first place, the discovery of the new world consisting of South America and North America, with the islands pertaining to them, was a result of general European, especially continental, development. It is a commonplace of history that the discovery of America grew out of the efforts on the part of Europe to find an unembarrassed highway for trade with the Orient. The countries which felt the need of such a highway particularly were those which, like the Italian republics, Portugal and Spain, were grouped about the Mediterranean Sea partly within the old limits of the classical world. New European developments of vast importance have brought into the orbit of civilization vast new peoples occupying regions lying far beyond the older boundaries. But the Mediterranean peoples were still the leaders in trade and commerce, still the bearers of culture to the rest of the European world, and they were the pioneers who, through inventions facilitating the navigation of the great ocean, as well as through enterprises stimulated partly by desire for gain and partly by religious zeal, revealed to the European world the existence of a world which to them was new.

Following the discoveries we have a series of explorations in which, first and last, nearly all of the European nations participated. We also have the conquest and partial occupation by Spain of large portions both of North and South America, together with some of the more important islands. Thus does America come into the great current of human history.

But while all this is true, and while it is true that chronologically the colonization of those portions of North America which later became the United States follows hard upon the Spanish colonizations, and is contemporary with French and Dutch attempts at colonization, yet the results of British colonization are historically so important that an incidental treatment of the origin of British colonization is logically and pedagogically a mistake. For British colonization is a new fact in the world. It leads us to results which we have every reason to believe are unique, and which would not have been brought about by the efforts of other nations. In a word, it was British colonization, with all that the word implies as to the strength of the movement, the character of the populations emigrating, the nature of the institutions founded and developed, the struggles both in Europe and America between British and other European interests that made the foundations for the great American Republic. We do less than justice to our conception of the dignity of American history when we fail to lay broad and deep the foundations for its study in the history of the Island Kingdom from which originally our nation sprang.

We therefore propose that in the fifth year pupils shall study stories of the Middle Ages and how man lived in the Middle Ages; stories of inventions and stories of maritime discoveries; also the dramatic stories connected with Spanish conquests and settlements in North and South America. Since we devote an entire year to this period (it should be remembered that at the present the sixth year is loaded with this feature of history plus the Greek and Roman world) it is reasonable to believe that children can be given enough interesting material, most of it in the form of dramatic narratives, to lay a very good foundation for the American history to be taken up systematically in the seventh grade. The supplementary reading which will naturally be from the literature of chivalry, of the Crusades, of the barbarian invasions of Europe, on the one hand, and from the stories of inventions, of discoveries and conquests on the other, will be admirably adapted to the psychology of fifth year pupils. A large proportion of this matter is geographical in its essence. The child is learning about world geography in a way that will suggest to him something of the feeling with which mankind itself, in the period under his study, learned the great fact that the world is not as it was formerly supposed to be.

In a word, it is only through such a correlation between history and geography as we propose that the child will come to appreciate how the race learned about its geographical inheritance; and only thus can he enter truly into the mysteries of race psychology during given periods, for example, the Renaissance period. Similar considerations require that he be given a glimpse of the great scientific discoveries, like those of Copernicus.

The contact of Europeans with the places found in the newly discovered world, affords an opportunity for some study of the natives of America between

whom and the early cave men, or the first civilized men, or the barbarians who overran Western Europe at the beginning of the Middle Ages, comparisons can be made and contrasts drawn. Possibly time can be found in this year for a few of those elementary principles of anthropology with which the mind of the child should be indoctrinated as the power of reflection upon principles of development grows.

In the sixth year we propose a very definite elementary study of English history as a background for American colonial beginnings, and for the story of American development economically, socially and politically to the point where the Revolution results in setting up the new republic. Probably we have already advanced arguments sufficient to justify this proposal. If it be true, as writers are fond of quoting, that "The roots of the present lie deep in the past," it is still not true that those "roots" will be found interpenetrating all of the past. The roots of the fir tree lie deep in the soil of the settler's field, but he will not for that reason dig all over the field in order to find those roots and clear them away. He will limit his excavations to a reasonable circle about the tree itself. The teacher of history will do well to emulate this practical sagacity. If the springs of American life up to and including the time of the Revolution itself are to be found in the history of that part of the European people who had lived a distinctive life for a thousand years, guarded but not isolated by their water barriers, then it is unwise to proceed as if the roots of American life were found sprawling indifferently through the history of Europe.

The study of English history here contemplated is not a high school study of English political and constitutional history. It is rather a collection of stories, of interesting narratives, organically connected and carrying over to the child mind (1) such ideas of the English character as will help him to understand the tenacity with which the Englishmen held to the idea of personal and political freedom; (2) which explain the impulse to emigrate and start new communities in the western world; (3) which help to impart an intelligible picture of life in the American colonies; (4) which show the trend toward industrial and commercial development in the eighteenth century England, together with the tendency toward imperial organization. The geography study should be pushed forward to include the notable explorations of British navigators like Byron, Cook, Vancouver, and others, the founding and development of the colonies in Australia and New Zealand, whose story, together with that of Africa and India, should in some way be brought down in outline to the present.

To the inventive predilections of eleven or twelve year old children much stimulating material will be found in the stories of the inventions connected with the history of the industrial revolution. These stories, too, can be so selected as to carry their civic and moral lessons, while commercial energy and enterprise resulting from the industrial revolution is the normal introduction to the study of British expansion, the

thrilling exploits of her great discoverers like Captain James Cook, who lay the basis for the modern British Empire. Geography again goes hand in hand with history.

Through supplementary reading as well as through the texts used much interesting information can and should be gained concerning the life of the American colonists both in their early adventures to the new world and in the several stages of growth down to the Revolutionary war. Historians have pointed out so clearly the leading phases of American development, first as the colonists hugged the Atlantic seaboard, and later as they spread into regions beyond the fall line where life was so different from the life on tidewater, that intelligent writers of children's books will have no difficulty in finding abundant material for their purposes.

Connected with this work on the colonists should go a development of the geographical knowledge of those portions of the United States occupied by the settlers up to the time of the Revolutionary war. We believe there is no occasion for divorcing the geography in this year from the history, and if the time usually devoted to the two subjects shall be used for the one a much more intensive and thorough piece of work in both history and geography will result. It goes without saying that many of the literary selections should concern themselves with features of the historical study covering England and colonial America.

THE SEVENTH GRADE.

Since we design for this grade no essential change from the arrangement that prevails in most schools, an arrangement which was suggested in the report of the Committee of Eight, very little needs to be said upon it here. Numerous excellent text-books have been provided for the study of American history from the middle of the eighteenth century, or thereabouts, to the present time by children of thirteen or fourteen years of age.

In our final report suggestions will be introduced correlating more closely than now is the case the work in history with the work in geography, civics, and elementary literature. It will be the aim, as it is now in many places, to complete in the seventh year the general survey of American history, including a discussion of the European war, on a plane which may be practicable for pupils of that age. Some of the more recent text-books have short chapters covering America's participation in the war particularly, with some account of the origin and development of the struggle to the time when the United States entered. Doubtless there will be provided in newer editions of all the texts properly graded material covering the war, and, let us hope, the peace and League of Nations also.

THE EIGHTH GRADE.

There are peculiar problems affecting the history work of this final year of the graded school. One of these problems arises from the fact that the eighth year is for some—the majority—of the pupils their

last year of school. For others, a very important minority, it constitutes the transition from the elementary school to the high school. It is necessary, in any case, because of the large number who will leave school at the end of the eighth grade, to plan the work in such a way as to make it the culmination of that training for citizenship which can be given to young pupils. At the same time the eighth year work must be made as definitely as possible a preparation for later high school courses in history.

The first objective mentioned requires that the work in the eighth year be pre-eminently citizenship training. The second objective requires that the method employed shall be essentially a high school method rather than a lower school method, which means that the study should be predominantly a study of problems.

Now we believe there is one plan by which both of these objectives can be successfully attained, and we present this plan for an eighth grade history and citizenship course under the general title of "Problems in American Democracy."

Having in mind still the economy of our plan of correlation, we aim to combine in this eighth grade course work in American geography, world geography, literature, history and civics. Our starting point would be a study of what might be called "Commercial Geography," giving to that term, however, a more comprehensive meaning than is customary. It would involve a rather intensive survey of production in those departments of American life in which our export trade, along major lines, originates. This study of production, as for example in the domain of lumber, will include the general features of the geography of the contributing regions, a close and lifelike description of the processes of manufacture, the social and economic conditions surrounding the business both locally and generally, and the national interest as affected by the question of the conservation of timber supplies. The next problem would be the marketing of the finished product which will carry us into a study of the home and foreign demands for lumber, the processes connected with shipping both by land and by water, the areas of the United States which are supplied from the different lumbering centers, and the conditions in the foreign countries which control the foreign trade.

In a study of cotton production and manufacture we shall have an intensely interesting opportunity for a practical resurvey of post-Civil War developments in the South, a study of the present-day tendencies in Southern agriculture and social life; and we shall get some insight into the race problem as it exists in the cotton states. We shall also come in vital contact with the story of the transformations wrought by the development of southern manufacturing, with its peculiar labor and other conditions; and we shall of course have before us that great feature of American economic history which grows out of the production of cotton goods in Northern manufacturing centers. The marketing of cotton manufactures abroad will involve not merely a generous study of world geography as it

affects American commerce, but it will involve also the imparting of some elementary notions of American trade policies.

Observations similar to those just made in regard to lumber and cotton can also be made with reference to wheat, corn, wool, beef, iron, and other staple productions entering into American foreign commerce.

The theory of this eighth year work is that it should be more strictly than any of the earlier years devoted to training in the exercise of citizenship. Now, in our country at the present time citizenship functions in connection with social, economic, political and international problems. What we propose, therefore, in this study is to open up to the pupil the main lines along which the citizen is bound to exercise his powers and judgment, so that, when he begins to take part in a responsible way he will already have some familiarity with the problems that present themselves for solution and with the principles on which solutions are to be sought.

The other feature of this year's work comes more nearly under the description of "Civics," as that term has ordinarily been applied. It will include a study of governmental organization, local, state and national, but the effort should be in each case to make the study as concrete as possible. Much interest has recently been shown in so-called "community civics." The studies of production as we conceive them will involve a great deal of community civics, but this will be organically bound up with the larger features of our national and international life. The pupil will belong to one or another of the producing communities. Beginning the study, therefore, right in his own home we get community civics as commonly conceived. But we do not leave the study there. It drives forward inevitably until it carries the mind of the child through the producing areas of his own country, into the consumption areas at home and abroad, resulting thus in building the conception of the "Greater Community."

It is clear from the above that we are correlating history with civics and with geography. We need only to add here that, according to our view, much of the knowledge which the child should get of places, and of processes of production, and in the way of commercial interchange of goods, should come through the reading of the best literature to be found bearing upon these things. The history teacher should not shun such descriptive stories as will give the child a dramatic introduction to the great features of American life. One thinks at once of the stories of the lumbermen, of western ranch life, the stories relating to wheat production, the idyls of the cotton field, together with poems bearing upon one or another phase of American life. It would be easy for the teachers of English to arrange their English selections with reference to the outline of studies projected for the history, civics and geography work.

THE HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN HISTORY.

We are not as yet prepared to present definite proposals for the high school courses. It will be recalled

that the committee has resolved in favor of two required high school courses. The first of these is to be in modern history and the second in United States history.

There are, however, still a good many questions to be determined before we can even propose for discussion definite outlines covering these two courses. Such questions as, What courses aside from the two required courses ought to be suggested; in what year shall the history work of the high school be given; shall the required courses be given strictly within two years, or, by a process of dilution, be carried through three or four years; these are only a few of the questions which must be considered and determined before we can proceed more definitely. We, therefore, desire to present in connection with this preliminary report a somewhat extended list of questions to which we invite the attention of history teachers. We will welcome responses from all who are disposed to aid the committee in reaching its conclusions. In all probability, we shall be prepared to present in the next issue a supplementary report covering the high school history curriculum.

The questions which we present below ought to prove of considerable interest to gatherings of history teachers and others interested in elementary and high school history instruction. We are particularly anxious to draw to them the attention of bodies of teachers who will gather for conferences at the various summer schools mostly during the months of June and July. And we particularly request directors of summer schools and heads of history departments to bring these questions in such form as they see fit before their conferences, get the reactions of their teachers upon them in the form of specific resolutions wherever that is possible, and forward the resolutions to our committee at the address given below.

QUESTIONS.

I.

The Common School Course in History.

1. Is correlation between history and geography in the grades practicable pedagogically?
2. Are the correlations suggested in the above statement workable?
3. What further suggestions for correlating history and geography can you present?
4. Is the suggested work for the third year as well calculated to develop the child's imagination and prepare him for the work of the later years as would be (a) work upon the Indian, or (b) work in mythological stories?
5. Would the stories of prehistoric man as suggested lend themselves to a helpful study of elementary civics?
6. What is the special value of biography as an approach to history in the third, fourth, fifth and sixth grades?
7. Are there any objections to changing the emphasis from the purely biographical treatment to a treatment which in part emphasizes the life and customs of the people?

8. What reading books suitable for the different grades would you recommend for the use of the children as texts?

9. What shall the committee say to prospective authors by way of setting standards of excellence in text-books? Make the answer as specific as possible.

10. Does this suggested outline emphasize sufficiently American history? European history?

11. What in your judgment are the specific objectives to be attained through the course as planned for the grades? Would it be best to state the objective for each grade. What would be a good statement for grade three, four, five, six, seven and eight?

12. Is the double approach to American history, (a) by way of the general European background presented in the fifth grade and culminating in discoveries and explorations; (b) through English history presented in the sixth grade and culminating in the development of the American colonies as a part of the British Empire, adequate as an introduction to the subject?

13. Is any more formal work in civics needed prior to the eighth grade than has been suggested?

II.

The High School Curriculum.

1. Shall modern history be given in the first year or in the second year of the high school? If the latter, what difference would it make in the outline of the course?

2. Is it desirable from the standpoint of citizenship that every pupil graduating from the high school shall have had a course in modern history and a course in United States history?

3. What modifications of present requirements for graduation would need to be made in order to provide for these two courses?

4. To what extent would the proposed two courses, one in modern history and one in United States history, satisfy the demand in your state or section?

5. Would there be serious objection to the elimination from the high school curriculum of the customary course in ancient history? If so, what are the special grounds on which that objection is placed?

6. The two courses above stated contemplate ten hours of work in history, five hours in each. Would there be any advantage in spreading this work over a longer period with fewer recitations per week, giving it practically the same time equivalent as in a two-year course?

7. What objection would there be to such an arrangement?

8. Should the minimum requirement of two years history be planned so as to form an organic part of a possible three or four year course?

9. What should constitute the third year or the first year of a three year course?

10. What should constitute the fourth year of a four year course?

11. What features of the United States history should be stressed with reference both to subordinate periods and new movements?

12. What features of modern history should be

stressed with reference both to subordinate periods and new movements?

13. What should be the objectives sought in a course in modern history? In the course in United States history?

14. How should the treatment of American history in the high school differ from its treatment in the grades?

15. How much attention, relatively, should be given in the United States history course for high school students to social and economic phases of American history?

16. What existing text-books represent most nearly your ideal respecting the subject matter to be presented in United States history?

17. What text-books represent most nearly your ideal of the method to be followed in presenting United States history?

APPENDIX.

A Suggested Course in History for the Grades.

(Visualization devices and processes to accompany subject matter throughout course.)

First and Second Year.—No history work distinct from reading.

Third Year.—Stories of Early Man. Also stories of the pre-Greek world.

Fourth Year.—(Stories of Greece and how the Greeks lived.) (Stories of Rome and how the Romans lived.) Treatment to be dramatic as for the third grade.

Fifth Year.—Stories of the Middle Ages; how men lived in the Middle Ages; stories of inventions and stories of maritime discoveries; also Spanish conquests and settlements in North and South America.

READINGS.—From literature of chivalry (classics where available). Stories of adventure—mainly in America. (Connect with geography.)

Sixth Year.—The story of England, including industrial revolution, English colonization in America; conflict with Spain, Holland, France, the trend toward Empire; English mode of life: (a) economic; (b) social; (c) political; life in the English colonies, seventeenth century and eighteenth century. Treatment in large part biographical.

READINGS.—A wide selection of material on English, American and European topics, adapted to the age of the pupils. Aim, to develop still further and to intensify the habit of independent reading and to deepen the effect of the systematic course.

Seventh Year.—American history from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present. (Supplemental readings to be suggested in final report.)

Eighth Year.—Problems in American democracy. (Readings to be suggested in final report.)

Respectfully submitted for discussion,

JOSEPH SCHAFER, Chairman.

DANIEL C. KNOWLTON, Secretary.

Of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools, 1133 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

One or Two Years of European History in High School

The preliminary program of the newly-appointed Committee on the Teaching of History and Citizenship, as printed in *THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK* for April, contains the suggestion for a one-year course in European history. The project is one possessing many difficulties and also having obvious advantages.

Before the committee takes final action on such an important matter, it should consider the possibility of cutting down the number of hours from five to three a week. Such a plan was advocated in an editorial in *The History Teacher's Magazine* for March, 1918.

The attention of the committee and of history teachers generally is drawn to the fact that this whole subject has recently been carefully studied by a special commission of the California State High School Teachers' Association. The principal documents relating to the work of this commission are here printed in full in the hope that they will help toward a solution of the problem for the entire country.

Four documents are here given: (1) an argument in favor of the one-year course prepared and delivered by the late Miss Harnett; (2) the report of the sub-committee for the Peninsula District of the State; (3) resolutions adopted by the sub-committee for the Bay Section; (4) the final report of the majority of the commission. Apparently no report was made by the minority.—EDITOR.

I. A ONE-YEAR COURSE IN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

BY THE LATE JANE E. HARNETT, OF THE LONG BEACH, CALIF., HIGH SCHOOL.

The problem of the course in European history is a perennial one. For over a quarter of a century committees of educational and historical associations have been endeavoring to decide what phases of this history shall be offered to the child in the different years of his high school course. The chief problem has been that of arranging for a presentation of the subject which shall be logical and profitable, both for the student who takes the complete course and for him who takes only a part of it. This problem has become increasingly difficult not only on account of the multiplication of courses in other subjects, but from the demand on the part of many of the teachers of history themselves for more attention to subjects dealing directly with the problems of citizenship, and for greater stress on modern history. The plan of the Committee of Seven adjusts itself easily to the child who takes only two of the three years' course which it provides. The Committee of Twenty-one has recently attempted to make provision for the child who

takes but a year and a half. For the child who takes less, no satisfactory arrangement seems to have been made. This child constitutes the problem which the European History Commission is attempting to solve.

The work done by the Commission so far has consisted principally in an attempt to discover, first, whether those students who take only one year of European history are sufficiently numerous in California to constitute a serious problem, and second, whether the schools of the state have found a satisfactory solution for this problem in the cases where it may exist.

A questionnaire was prepared in which each school was asked to state the courses offered in history and allied subjects, the minimum requirement for graduation in this work, the number of graduates in 1917, the number of these graduates who had taken two years of European history, the number who had taken but one year and of what this one year consisted. A request was also made for suggestions in regard to a one-year course. An attempt was made to send this questionnaire to every high school in the state, but for various reasons the number reached was far short of the total. In all some one hundred and forty schools responded. In many instances, however, the replies were incomplete. In several cases it was evident that the question in regard to the number of years of European history taken by the graduates was answered so as to include the history of the United States. The reports from two of the largest schools, San Diego and Los Angeles Polytechnic High School, had to be omitted, because in the case of the former the statistics were for a ten-year period, and threw no light on the present situation, while the latter found it impossible to ascertain the facts in regard to its graduates. Furthermore, many of the reports were received by the chairman so late that anything like a thorough and scientific organization has been impossible. Bearing in mind these unfavorable conditions, let us examine a few of the facts which the replies seem to disclose. The total number of graduates from the one hundred and thirty-eight schools was four thousand eight hundred eighty-seven. Of these, two thousand two hundred ten, or forty-five per cent., had taken two years of European history, and one thousand three hundred fifty-one, or twenty-eight per cent., had taken one year, leaving one thousand three hundred twenty-six, or slightly over twenty-seven per cent., who had taken no European history at all.

From these figures two points seem to be pretty definitely established; first, that in these schools a one-year course in European history is an established fact, so far as considerably over one-fourth of their graduates are concerned; and, second, that the problem of what to do for the student who takes less than two years of European history is a real problem, since

it concerns fifty-five per cent. of all the graduates from these schools.

The figures are still more interesting when we consider only the schools of over a hundred graduates. In these schools also only forty-five per cent. of the graduates had taken two years, but only twenty-four per cent. one year, leaving thirty-one per cent. with no European history. This includes two large San Francisco schools in one of which two years of European history are required, and in the other, a girls' high school, where all but thirteen of the graduates had taken at least two years. In the twelve remaining schools of over a hundred graduates the percentage for two years of European history is thirty-seven, and for one year, twenty-seven, leaving thirty-six per cent. with none at all. These proportions would probably not be greatly changed could the statistics from San Diego and Los Angeles Polytechnic be included, for while San Diego, on the ten-year period, showed seventy-six per cent. of its graduates to have taken two years and only five per cent. none at all, Los Angeles Polytechnic with a total enrollment of two thousand students, showed only ninety-nine to be in classes for the first year of European history and sixty for the second.

These figures would seem to warrant the conclusion that the problem is more acute in the cities than in the country districts, and that it is greatest in those schools which are establishing the newer vocational courses. This would seem to show that the problem is likely to become more rather than less acute as time goes on, for these courses are constantly increasing, and even the country schools are beginning to establish them.

Thus the existence of the problem seems to be indisputable, but statistics to show the extent to which the schools are meeting the situation are so meager as to be of very little value. Five schools report a one-year course, four of these giving general history, and one a year made up of a half year of ancient history and a half year of the industrial aspects of modern civilization. The few schools which reported the nature of the course taken by their one-year students, showed eight hundred eighty-eight to have taken ancient history, or a combination of ancient and medieval; two hundred ninety-nine to have taken medieval and modern history, fifteen modern history, seventy-one English history and seventy-two general history. Thus eighty-nine per cent. of these one-year students took the first half of the two-year course, which, with their year course in American history and civics, made the sum of the history which they had before graduation.

The suggestions made by the teachers as to a one-year course have not been sufficiently collated to enable me to use them here. There seems, however, to be a good deal more demand for a one-year course from the southern part of the state than from the northern or central regions. At a recent meeting of the Social Science Association of Southern California, which was attended by some fifty or more teachers of

history, a general discussion of the subject brought out only one expression of opinion which was not favorable to making provision in a special course or courses for the student who can take but one year of European history, and the replies to the questionnaires from the southern part of the state show, many of them, a strong demand for the same thing. Farther north, vigorous expressions of disapproval are more common, the objection seeming to be based principally on two grounds: the fear of establishment of a one-year course may work to the further diminution of the number taking two years, and the certainty that the subject cannot be adequately taught in less than two years. So far, then, the replies to the questionnaires seem to warrant the belief, first, that the question what to do for the boy or girl who has not time for two years of European history constitutes a real problem; and second, that the high schools of our state have done but little in the way of solving it.

It would seem evident also that the problem of the child who takes but one year of European history is closely bound up with that of the child who takes no European history at all, and I feel that in solving the one we shall go a long way toward solving the other. That the two together constitute a very serious problem will scarcely be denied at a time when our democracy is taking so important a part in world affairs, and when a feeling of world citizenship and an intelligent interest in world problems are such an important part of the equipment of every boy and girl.

The Commission is not yet in a position to offer a solution for the problem, though it hopes to have some plans to present at the meeting of the State Teachers' Association next summer. The suggestions which I shall make at this time are in no sense official, and while many of the ideas contained in them have been presented or agreed to by different members of the Commission, I shall assume the entire responsibility for anything contained in them which does not meet the approval of those present.

In the first place, I am firmly convinced that there is no possibility of solving this problem by requiring every student to take two years of European history. The demands from other subjects are so great, and the requirements for entrance into various technical colleges are such that we are likely always to have a large number of students who have not time for the two years. The question, then, is simply this: Should courses be arranged with a view to meeting the needs of the one-year students more satisfactorily than does the half of the two-year course which eighty-nine per cent. of them are taking at the present time? Could such courses be arranged I am convinced that a great many of those who take no European history at all would find it possible to take one year. In fact, I have found heads of vocational departments willing and glad to include such a course in their required work, and at least one principal has gone on record as favoring the making of such a course compulsory for all students who do not take the regular two years.

The next question to be considered is whether a single year of European history can be made really profitable to the student. Before this can be answered I think we should examine our aim in the teaching of history, that we may be able to determine whether enough of this aim can be accomplished in a year course to make the plan advisable or profitable from the standpoint of the child.

It will, I think, be generally agreed that the great function of history is to explain to us how the present came to be, and thus to aid us in the solution of its problems. To the common man, history is valuable in proportion to its accomplishment of this end. History, then, will appear to us not as a subject consisting of facts to be taught, but as a great life current, into which historians are constantly dipping back to find for us the events and movements which aid us in the understanding of our environment. As society becomes more complex our need of historians becomes increasingly greater, for we must be constantly turning to the past for the explanation of new phenomena and new problems. We insist with greater emphasis upon the careful preservation of all kinds of records, for we never know when the things which seem valueless to-day will be just the necessary connecting links in some historical development.

Historians and archivists, however, will be of little value to us if the common man does not acquire the habit of constantly demanding of them the explanation of the problems of his environment. Particularly is this true of a democracy where problems of national and world importance are dealt with by the people themselves or by their representatives. We all remember the kind of arguments that were used upon the street corners, at meetings of Chambers of Commerce, and even in Congress, in regard to the exemption of our coastwise ships from tolls in the Panama Canal. How little attempt there was to solve the question in the light of past development of the situation. Over and over again one heard it discussed as though it were simply a question of our having a perfect right to do as we pleased with our own property. Again, more recently, in the discussion of the right to travel on the high seas in time of war, or to trade in arms with belligerents, we found the same tendency to regard these as isolated questions quite apart from their historical development.

Now it is obviously impossible that the members of a democracy, however good its system of education, should be sufficiently well versed in history to enable the individual to draw upon his own knowledge of history for the explanations which the present is constantly demanding of him. Even if he has had a remarkably catholic education in history, new situations will be constantly arising the comprehension of which will involve a use of historical information which was perhaps not considered valuable when the books which he studied were written. If, however, he has acquired a habit of turning to the past for the explanation of the present, and a training in weighing and sifting evidence so as to test the value of historical information, he can safely leave the business of fur-

nishing the facts and tracing the development to the historians themselves. But the trouble is, it is just this habit, this curiosity about the past, that the average man of to-day lacks. The trouble with the citizen of to-day is not chiefly that he does not know history, but that he does not turn to history to obtain that which only history can give him, and, consequently, the work of our historians, except for a very small proportion of the common people, has been labor taken in vain. And yet there never was a time when the common man stood in greater need of the aid which history can give him. The problems which he is now being called upon to solve, and those which he will face at the close of the war must be solved in the light of past development, not only in the history of our own country, but in that of the world.

Surely, then, our one great aim in the teaching of history must be to arouse in our students the desire to look to the past for the explanation of the present. We must awaken curiosity about the past in its relation to the present. We must establish a habit of endeavoring to satisfy that curiosity by the use of all available data. We must train them in the ability to test the truth of evidence, to weigh and sift and fairly and impartially judge. And, above all, we must stimulate them to the utmost use of their own powers in the solution of the questions which they have raised. Assuredly, to do this we must make them feel that the problems of the present are *their* problems. In saying this it is not my purpose to belittle in any way the value of inspiring the child with a love of history for its own sake. If this be one of the products of the work it means a valuable enrichment of the life of the student. Nevertheless, even if this be achieved, the teaching of history has failed of its greatest aim if it does not arouse in the child a curiosity about the past and its relation to the present, if it does not develop in him the ability to discover the facts of the past which have a bearing on the problems of the present. And this curiosity about the past, this ability to use its aid and form judgments in regard to its meaning, are qualities for which every man or woman, no matter how humble and unintellectual his occupation, will have constant need. Now the question arises, can anything be done in the short space of one year to achieve this aim in the teaching of European history?

Certainly, if we regard European history as a subject to be taught—a subject having a certain content of facts which must be learned—we shall agree with the teacher who noted on his questionnaire, "I do not believe that the subject can be presented to high school pupils satisfactorily in that time." Such an objection would seem to imply that we have agreed upon a certain number of facts which should be taught in the subject of European history, that we have found by experience that the child can master these in two years, when conveniently arranged in two text-books of some six hundred pages apiece; but that it is out of the question for him to do so in less. Assuredly when we attempt to condense these facts into one six-hundred-page text-book, we are apt to

get that which the Committee of Ten found in general history—namely, either a compendium of facts or a mass of generalizations. On the other hand, if we can once lay aside the idea of history as a subject made up of carefully selected facts to be taught and think of it as a great life current which is constantly advancing and we ourselves with it, realizing that this current is made up of an infinite number of movements, each of which may help to make the present more intelligible, we shall at once abandon all thought of giving to a sixteen-year-old child in one year, or even in two or three, any comprehensive grasp of these movements. Surely, however, a year could be spent very profitably in aiding the child to search that current for the movements which will explain a few of the problems or institutions in which he is interested to-day. Could not one term, or even a few weeks, be used to tremendous advantage in getting him to realize through experiments which he himself shall make, the necessity of looking to the past—and often to the far distant past—for the explanation of the present? If this can be done, and I firmly believe that it can, then a year of European history will be just as valuable to the child who can spend no more time on the subject, as his first year will be to the child who is going to continue it for two.

Our first point, then, in regard to the year course in European history would be this: it must not be a mere condensation of the two-year course, an epitome of the essential facts of history—whatever these may be. Nor, on the other hand, will the first half of the two-year course achieve our purpose any better, although this is, as we have seen, the course now being taken by a very large proportion of our one-year students. It is difficult for a student to realize that he is getting from history an explanation of how the present came to be when that explanation is cut off so many centuries before his time and the connection is only made incidentally through comparison and contrast. The second half of the two-year course, preceded by a hasty summary of the earlier period would meet this objection by making the connection with the present, but this is, after all, only general history again, although with the strong emphasis on the events of the later centuries. If enough of ancient history is included to give the realization of the age-long development of many of our present problems and institutions, this course, too, will include the study of so large a mass of material that it is almost certain to become chiefly a systematic study of facts.

Both of these solutions seem after all to be based on the idea that European history is a subject containing a certain number of facts which, according to some one's decision, educated persons ought to know. We cannot give the child all these facts in one year; therefore, we say, let us give him half of them, that he may at least master these. It is undoubtedly true that all of European history cannot be taught in one year. Can it be taught in a life-time? The question is, what can we get from this great life current which will best meet the present needs of our high school students? Since we have but one year it must

necessarily be a matter of selection. The trouble has been that we teachers—yes, and the makers of the text-books, too—have been guided in that selection by what tradition has decreed that educated people ought to know. We are so afraid that our students are going to miss some of these things that we pour into them a mass of information, the greater part of which they promptly forget as soon as they get out of our hands.

Now can we not, in our one-year course at least, lay aside this idea, and try to determine what problems in the child's present environment most need the explanation which European history can give, and then set him to work at tracing out the development of just so many of these as he can achieve in the space of one year? Perhaps we may select one general problem, for the whole year, perhaps one for each term. We may prefer to work on several at the same time. My own preference would be to take one problem at a time, making its solution the work of a whole term. This, however, is a matter of minor importance. The essential point is that whatever the child is working on shall be a matter which is of moment and of interest to him. He must realize that it is his problem, that he is actually tracing from the past the development of something in his present life or that of those about him—preferably something in which he is keenly interested. In all his dealings with the past he must never lose sight of the goal in the present, and he must see clearly each day the relation of that day's work to this goal. He must realize that he is not studying the past for its own sake, but simply because of the light which it throws upon the present.

It will thus be easily seen that no one fixed course in European history can be mapped out. The question as to what problems or institutions of the present the child shall trace from their beginnings in the past in order to understand them better as they are to-day will have to be answered in the light of the maturity of the class, and of the problems in which they are or can be interested, and in whose solution they may have an opportunity to assist. Account must also be taken of the historical material which is available, and of the ability of the teacher to guide the efforts of the class in any given direction.

The problems or institutions whose development is to be traced should preferably be such as have their beginnings in the remotest antiquity concerning which information has been secured, in order that the child may have some realization of the slow development of human ideas and institutions, and of the complexity of conditions which affect them. It is interesting to see in recent numbers of *The History Teacher's Magazine* how the four committees of historians, working in conjunction with the National Board for Historical Service, itself composed of eminent historians and teachers of history, are advising the centralizing of the teaching of certain phases of history about problems which the present crisis has rendered most acute. Some of the problems which they suggest for the central theme of a certain phase of history might well form the basis for a whole term's work. Thus, Pro-

fessor Ferguson, in the November number, suggests for a phase of ancient history the problem of making a strong union, which does not spell despotism or military control, out of a number of diverse and competing nationalities. What could be better as the basis of a term's or perhaps a whole year's work in European history? At a recent meeting of the Social Science Association of South California, Professor Knoles, of the University of Southern California, suggested such problems as the development of nationalism, of artificial barriers of trade, of colonization, and of democracy. All of these, it can readily be seen, are not only problems of vital importance at the present day, but have their beginnings in the remote past. For younger students, supposing the course were to be given in the first year of high school, such a problem as how man has gradually gained a mastery of his environment by mechanical means, or how he has struggled to work out the problems of social control arising from this mechanical control, or how he has attempted to add beauty to his life, as well as the development of the home or of the school, might prove more suitable. In Long Beach we are trying out a course for ninth-year girls in the development of the home, and so far, the results seem amply to justify the experiment.

From first to last, however, it must be borne in mind that no matter how useful the information which the boy or girl is obtaining from the study of such problems or institutions, the work is not really a success unless there is developed the feeling that these are really his problems and unless the child acquires the ability and the personal desire to solve such problems for himself. In the first place, the approach to the problem for the term must always be made through the avenue of some phase of it in which the child is naturally interested. Thus, the statement that the work of the term was going to center about the problem of making among diverse nationalities an effective union which shall not be a tyranny might sound even less attractive to the child than the statement that he was to study European history. A few lessons, however, on the present problem of world peace will easily arouse his intense interest in the subject, and he will be readily stimulated to the joy of discovery in seeking what light the past can throw upon it.

The question of method would seem to bear but little relation to the subject of this paper, and yet the highest aim of our year course—the development of the child's initiative—can scarcely be achieved unless we lay aside the method which gives to the student at least, the impression that the study of history consists in acquiring information which is to be given to the teacher in class, and which may be cheerfully forgotten when all the necessary examinations are over. To effect this we must realize that school is life, not merely a quiet side stream where the child is preparing to meet the problems of life. We must get away from the idea that he can best prepare for the work of life by doing in school that which he will never do

when he gets out of school, namely, sit down to acquire facts to be given back orally or in writing to a superior being in the more or less—usually less—critical presence of his equals. Life consists in doing things, in solving problems, not in learning facts in the hope that some day they may prove useful. In life we use facts in order to arrive at a correct conclusion. We use them as a guide to speech and action. We marshal them to prove a conclusion which we think we have established. Why should not the child learn to use facts in this way? This, I believe, he can best do through the so-called problem method combined with some form of socialized recitation. Each day's work should consist of a problem which bears directly upon the problem for the term, and this problem must be worked out by each individual to the best of his ability with the use of all the resources at his command. Each should have an opportunity as frequently as possible to present his solution to his classmates, and when he has done so to lead the discussion of the points which they may raise, to meet their objections, to answer their questions. In the same way if another is presenting his solution he should be ready, the moment his classmate has finished, to ask questions, make criticisms, challenge statements, or add information, the teacher keeping entirely in the background and only entering into the discussion occasionally to ask a question or to offer a suggestion. The text-book will be frequently in use to prove a point. Facts will be found to have a very decided use and will be sought and acquired by reason of that use.

The probabilities are that the average child will learn and remember a great many more facts as a result of using them in this way than he would ever do if the learning of facts were the main business in the preparation of his day's work. He will in addition have developed a curiosity about facts and an ability to use them in relation to the present which will be of far greater value to him than any accumulation of information with which he may incidentally store his mind. He will develop that which he will need more than anything else in life, the ability and the desire to think for himself and express that thought effectively to others—the habit of attacking problems as a hunter goes to the chase or a horse to the six-barred gate. He may even leave the study of history without the self-satisfied feeling that he has mastered a subject, but with the keen realization that there are many other problems of vital importance to himself and to others which a further knowledge of the past will help him to solve, and with a real desire to solve them with such aid as this will give. If this be achieved it will easily be seen that the one-year course will in no wise redound to the injury of the two-year course. It will be far more likely to necessitate the establishment—at least in the larger high schools—of several one-year courses, and the student who has worked out certain problems in one year will be very likely, if his course permits, to go on and take up other problems in his second year. And who can say

that he will not in two such years get quite as much out of his two years as the student who takes the regular two years' course gets out of his? We might even some day find that this was the better plan for the two-year course itself.

To such courses as have been suggested the objection will doubtless be made that no text-books have been written to make such a plan possible. It is certainly true that much of the material which the student will need for the successful working out of his problems has not yet found its way into our text-books, and that for the successful working of such a plan the child will need, not one text-book, but several, and a library of many other books besides. For this difficulty I believe the free text-book law will offer a solution. Instead of buying one text-book for each child, our boards of education might buy such a variety as is desired, and place them in the school library. In this way a whole class could easily obtain access to any book of which there were as many copies as one-third or one-fourth of the number of students in the class. A list of suggestive references provided by the teacher, and occasionally a syllabus, will give the child what guidance he may need in the finding of his material. It is certainly to be hoped that writers of text-books will not be inspired to prepare hand-books of problems, and text-books to fit them, which would do for the child what we are too much inclined to do as it is, namely, to give him conclusions all worked out and ask him to learn them. We may, however, perhaps ask them to include in their text-books, many matters not at present considered.

A further objection to the plan may suggest that such courses will fail to give the child the background of history which is necessary to the successful prosecution of any kind of research work. For my own part, I firmly believe that the child will acquire what background he needs as he works out his problems; that what he gains in this way will make a far greater impression on his mind than if he were storing it up just for the sake of having it; and that his desire to prove his points, to establish his conclusions, will lead him to the acquisition of a vastly greater and better organized store of historical material than if he were studying his text-book page by page and doing a certain amount of required outside reading every week. I feel assured that we shall meet no objection from the university professors on the score that this will not give our graduates the facts which they need for the successful prosecution of their study of history in the university, for they one and all agree that this is just what our present method of teaching history fails to do. Furthermore, I do not know of any university which requires a high school course in European history as a prerequisite for its freshman history courses. What they demand of our graduates is undoubtedly no other than that which the world demands of them, namely, the ability and the desire to think and to solve problems, the ability to test facts and to select that which is essential and significant.

I hope, indeed, that this plan for the year course will not altogether be condemned by the universities, for its successful working out will require much assistance on their part. Those of us who have been teaching history for the last twenty years in California know full well what a vast debt high school teaching of history owes to our universities. We have watched the gradual disappearance of the applicants for positions in history who were prepared in Latin or mathematics, but "could teach" history. We have seen them succeeded by graduates not only well trained in the study of history, but instructed in the methods by which it should be taught, with some experience in the actual teaching and a tremendous enthusiasm for the work itself. We have seen the reflection of this work in the teaching of history in our schools. Surely, then, it is to the universities that we shall turn for aid in the developing of our new courses in European history. It is they who will watch with interest the attempts of the teachers in our schools, acting as a clearing-house for information concerning courses which have been successful, and placing at the disposal of all the fruits of the experience of individuals. Most important of all, it is they who will prepare teachers of history who can actually plan and teach such courses, for after all the greatest difficulty in our whole plan will consist in finding teachers who are able and willing to carry it out. Why should not such work be made the basis for an advanced degree in the teaching of history? Could not experiments be worked out by graduate students, teaching in university high schools under the direction and supervision of experienced teachers, and the professors of history whose main business is the instruction of prospective teachers of history? Why should all the advanced degrees in history be awarded for the writing of history? Surely those who are preparing to teach history outnumber those who are preparing to be historians. Think what it would mean to the profession of history teaching if our teachers, after a year or two of teaching, or even before they begin to teach, could spend a year in graduate work whose thesis should consist in the writing and the successful working out with a class of a course adapted to the class which they were given an opportunity to instruct! It would undoubtedly bring about a much closer relationship between the high school teachers of history and the history department of the universities and a much more frequent occurrence of the return for a year's work on the part of the teacher who has settled down to the teaching of history as a life business.

To sum up, then, our year course will be neither a condensation of the two years' course nor the incomplete half of that course. It will consist in the working out by the student himself from the remote past of some of the problems in which he or the people about him are interested. The test of its success will lie in the attitude and point of view and in the power of the students who have taken the course. Have they a vital interest in the problems of to-day? Do they look upon them as their problems? Are they

eager to see what light history throws upon their solution? Do they read their newspaper with greater critical attitude and broader understanding? Do they feel that the world problems which that news involves are their problems, and that the history with which they are familiar, or—and this is far more likely—history with which they are not familiar must be consulted if a workable solution is to be found? Will they instantly challenge the solution which ignores the past? Will they test solutions offered in the light of their foundation on what man has already worked out? It is perhaps too much to ask that the average man will himself turn to the past for aid in his own solution, for this will mean the development of a degree of initiative and personal responsibility in regard to matters of community, national and world interest which our educational system is very far at present from achieving. This, nevertheless, is the goal at which our teaching of history must aim. This is wherein lies the glorious opportunity of the teacher of history. It is this which makes the profession of the teaching of history seem the greatest, the broadest, the most wonderful work ever given mortal to do. If we can only teach history so as to develop in the common man and woman that initiative, that responsibility, that power to think and reason and organize—that joy in real thinking which has made all the leaders this world has ever had—then, surely, we as teachers of history are doing what lies in our power to make democracy safe for the world.

II. REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE EUROPEAN HISTORY COMMISSION FOR THE PENINSULA DISTRICT.

In response to the general question propounded by the Commission, "What European history should be provided for high school students who cannot take more than one year?" we beg leave to offer the following suggestions:

I. *Present State of the Problem of History Teaching in the Schools.*

1. It is manifest on all sides that we are confronted, in our American education, with a period of wide overturning and readjustment. Much of the present agitation for change is purely spectacular and ephemeral; much of it has its roots in the deepest reality. That great good will come of the agitation none of us needs to doubt. But meanwhile there is increased demand for sobriety and steadiness of thought. And nowhere does this principle apply with more force and pertinence than in the field of history teaching. We have had our well-established traditions reaching back to the reports of the Committee of Seven and the Committee of Ten. Under the leadership thus provided history teaching has made amazing progress, and has accomplished results of which it need not be ashamed. But we cannot live on our record; we must confront new issues as they arise. And such a time of reconsideration and readjustment seems now to be upon us.

2. As evidence of this new point of view, we may

cite the report of the Committee of Twenty-one, published in 1916.¹ This report attempts to provide a program of studies in the Social Sciences for elementary and secondary schools. It offers a radical departure from past usages in many directions. And thus it opens afresh the whole problem of the place and purpose in our education of history and allied subjects. That the recommendations of the Committee of Twenty-one are all sound and wholesome, we do not believe. But it must be recognized that they are symptomatic of the times and are bound to have great weight in shaping our future policies.

3. The demand for a general reconsideration of the history problem appears also very clearly in the significant meeting of the Teachers' Section of the American Historical Association at Philadelphia last December,² and especially in the wise and stimulating paper of Professor Johnson. The whole trend of the discussion at Philadelphia was in the direction of a broad review of the issue from the most general point of view. There has been too much empirical tinkering with this phase or that phase of the history program. What we need is complete and symmetrical rebuilding of the structure from the ground up. That does not imply any radical breach with the past, any untried and dangerous innovations. It does imply better adjustments, more co-ordination, and a fuller unity in our history work.

4. In the light of these conditions, it seems to us inopportune to inaugurate here in California such an experiment as the one-year course. It does not greatly interest the country as a whole. It deals with a very limited phase of a vastly larger problem which is up for readjustment. It would be much wiser and more serviceable for us to devote our energies to this larger problem. If the present Commission or some similar body could take up the whole question of European history in the schools, from the primary grades to the senior high school, and work it through to some definite result, it would be making a contribution of great worth at the present moment. The issue we are dealing with seems to us too narrow and provincial to occupy our thoughts when bigger demands are upon us. It is our opinion, therefore, that the best policy for the Commission would be to ask that it be discharged without recommendation or that it be empowered to widen its functions to suit the larger occasion.

5. But since no such action has been authorized, we duly submit our conclusions upon the merits of the proposal for a one-year course in European history. In so doing we desire to record our deep regret at the untimely death of Miss Harnett, who, probably more than any other, was interested in the one-year plan. No one who listened to her able presentation of the case at Berkeley last November could doubt for a moment her utter sincerity, devotion, and singleness of purpose. It is to be hoped that her paper may be

¹ "The Social Studies in Secondary Education." Washington, Government Printing Office, 1916.

² *History Teacher's Magazine*, February, 1918.

published as the most comprehensive presentation of that point of view yet brought forward. The position she defended does not seem to us sound and reliable; but we cannot take issue with it, as we are compelled to do, without this expression of respect and admiration for the departed leader.

II. *The Demand for a One-Year Course.*

1. The campaign for a one-year course in European history rests on the assumption of an *imperative need* for such a course. If the assumption is correct, the movement should have the earnest support of all progressive teachers. But it is not out of place to inquire, first of all, if such a need really exists.

2. The statistics gathered from twenty-two schools in the Peninsula district show that about forty per cent. of the graduates in 1916 had only one year of European history, fifty-three per cent. had taken two years, and seven per cent. had taken three years or more. If these figures are fairly representative, they prove that a clear majority of students are still able to get more than one year of European history, if they have a chance and are encouraged to do so.

3. The statements of teachers accompanying these statistics indicate that, for the most part, they find no insuperable difficulties in getting their pupils to register for a second year or more. It is the belief of your sub-committee that this matter rests largely in the hands of the history teachers in our schools. If the teaching is effective and the teachers earnestly seek to hold their pupils for the longer courses, they will succeed in such degree as to make the one-year course the exception and not the rule. The pupil should never be allowed to think the one-year course as good as the two-year or three-year course. The advantages of more prolonged study of the subject should be made evident and attractive to him in every legitimate way.

4. It is a mistake, in the opinion of your sub-committee, to assume that any ground yielded in the field of European history can be saved for other branches of the social sciences. A good many faithful and competent teachers have favored the shorter course in European history because they wanted more time for economics or civics or current history or the like. But it remains to prove that they could accomplish their ends in this way. The pressure for a shorter course in history in the high school comes chiefly from the non-cultural and vocational interests, and not from within. Other cultural subjects are also under fire from the same quarter—language, science, mathematics. Any yielding to this demand is likely to result in an absolute reduction of the time allowed, not merely for European history, but for all non-vocational subjects in the curriculum of the high school. If the history teacher has to yield to this pressure, he must of course make the best of it. But it is difficult to find adequate reasons why he should be an active party to his own undoing.

5. Many teachers are strongly influenced by the desire to make history itself a more "practical and

utilitarian subject, and therefore more in harmony with the vocational trend of present educational thought and practice." In a large measure this impulse is legitimate and praiseworthy. More than ever before history has the opportunity to demonstrate its practical worth to the common man and the citizen. Our teachers do well to capitalize the occasion to the fullest extent. But there are serious dangers involved in the situation against which we all need to be on our guard. There is a tendency to regard all history as "dead and worthless," unless its connection with present-day problems is altogether obvious. There is a tendency to regard recent history as of vastly greater moment to us, and therefore as more worthy of study than any portion of the remoter past. And there is a tendency to substitute for history, in the proper sense of the word, some form or other of the social sciences—economics, sociology, and the like—which is thought to have more practical and vital relation to the world in which we live. Some phases of these tendencies will claim consideration in a later part of this report. It is enough to say here that, in the judgment of the present committee, if these interests can find a place in the high school only by the sacrifice of a solid, comprehensive course in European history, they are not worth the price. All of our institutions, our civilization itself, rest on European foundations. Your sub-committee puts itself squarely on the ground that *nothing else* can take the place, in our secondary schools, of a well-balanced and adequate course in European history, as a thing essential in itself and as the necessary prerequisite for American history and government. If we do not favor a one-year course in European history, it is because, in our opinion, such a course involves the sacrifice of proper training in the essentials of an indispensable subject.

III. *The Influence of the One-Year Course.*

It seems legitimate also to call attention to the fact that the introduction of a one-year course in European history into our schools, with free election on the part of students, would inevitably draw after it certain serious consequences.

1. If the shorter course came in alongside of longer courses in the same subject, permitting students to get their European history in one year or in two as they chose, the shorter course would strongly tend to drive the longer ones from the field. The same result would follow in any other subject of instruction. Pupils will not take two years for any task which they are allowed to complete in one. If they are allowed to do their European history in one year, it would be contrary to human nature if they did not follow the line of least resistance.

2. From the standpoint of the school, also, and its teaching problem, the shorter course would tend to supersede the longer one. The smaller schools at least, with their limited budgets and overworked teachers, could not afford to offer both shorter and longer courses in the same subject. If the new course comes in, something else must go out; and it requires

no great degree of wisdom to see that in this competition the more substantial treatment of European history would have to give way. In the larger schools the two courses might for a time maintain themselves side by side, but in the end the shorter course would tend to win, not because it was the better, but because it cost less and was guaranteed to get results in about as satisfactory a way.

3. As we see the situation, the shorter course would ultimately lead to a reduction of the amount of time given to historical studies in the schools. We have already expressed the conviction that this movement had its origin in the endeavor to restrict the cultural subjects in the school curriculum; and in the degree in which the movement succeeds, we believe it will accomplish its purpose. Even if the time taken away from European history could be saved for other historical studies, we should doubt the wisdom of the innovation. Much more is it to be deplored, if the time thus released is lost entirely to historical studies and is devoted to quite other ends. We are aware that many useful and desirable subjects are seeking entrance into the high school. Every open-minded teacher of history must give them welcome and wish them well. But this is no time for the teacher of history to deny his birthright or to sacrifice in the least degree his sacred responsibility in the training of youth for citizenship and for the service of society. If the course in European history is not essential to these great ends, it ought to be dropped entirely; if it is essential, it ought to be kept at full strength and made more and more effective for the work in hand. It ought not to be difficult to convince history teachers that their specialty has quite little enough time in the school program, and that any curtailment is a calamity not to be thought of.

4. We believe also that the shorter course in European history would inevitably lead to a poorer quality of teaching and a poorer quality of learning. The half can never be equal to the whole. No subject can be taught as well in one year as in two, or as well in two years as in three. These principles are axiomatic. And yet we find teachers ready to maintain that they can "cover" European history in one year and do as good work as they formerly did in two or three. It may be granted that, in certain respects, if the teaching is competent, the abbreviated course may yield excellent results. But it certainly cannot yield the comprehensive and coherent knowledge of European history which is the only legitimate ideal of historical instruction in the schools. By a "comprehensive" knowledge we mean a reasonable grasp of the big essentials of European history as a whole; by a "coherent" knowledge we mean a reasonable insight into the causal connection of events and movements as the centuries pass along. Without these results historical study has little justification; with them it becomes fruitful in the highest degree. And because the one-year course must inevitably sacrifice these ends, we feel constrained to take sides against it.

5. It may be noted again that the proposed one-

year course in European history is, to all intents and purposes, a return to the course in "general history" of a generation ago. This fact in itself gives no occasion for condemning the project; but it does justify a moment's attention to the history of general history in our schools. Before 1900 this was the most common type of historical instruction in American secondary schools. But in 1899 the Committee of Seven put itself on record as opposed to any course in general history, on the ground that such a course must fail because it attempts too much. Under the influence of the report of 1899, general history very rapidly disappeared from our schools. During these twenty years the four-years course in history has mainly controlled the situation. Such are the facts. If present conditions make it wise to reverse our previous experience and to restore the course in general history, we ought not to hesitate. But at the least we ought to inquire diligently whether any such occasion has arisen; we ought to know whether the arguments brought against the general course twenty years ago are still valid or not. It is true the teachers of to-day would not call the one-year course a course in general history; it is probably true they would not make of the course just what the teachers of the last generation made of it. But the fact remains that in attempting to teach European history in one year, by any method whatsoever, they are really reverting to the policy which historical experience has weighed in the balance and found wanting. The one-year course cannot help being, in its essential nature, a course in general history.

6. The last statement may be qualified in one direction. When the one-year course gives up the attempt to present a comprehensive and coherent review of European development, and arbitrarily selects episodes for exploitation here and there, it ceases to be even general history and becomes merely a historical scrap-bag for the use of other branches of learning. Historical facts and episodes are constantly employed in the teaching of language, literature, art, science, and the like; but such employment, even on the largest scale, does not constitute the study of history. Even where history is used to illustrate and confirm the teaching of its affiliated social sciences, such as politics, economics, sociology, the same thing is true; it is not history in the proper sense of the term. In the opinion of the present committee, this is the point at which the movement for a one-year course in European history shows its true nature and its radical weakness. It seeks to subordinate history to other branches of school instruction; at any rate it clearly tends to bring about such subordination. If this were the largest service of which history is capable in our secondary education, no one could rightly raise objection to such subordination. But for those of us who believe that historical study has unique and indispensable values in school education, it is a hard saying. We believe history should be taught as history and not reduced to the status of handmaiden to any other interest whatsoever. In the degree in which the movement

for a one-year course has this animus we believe it to be undesirable and dangerous for our schools.

IV. *European History in the High School.*

1. It seems fitting at this point to raise the question: "If not the one-year course, what European history should be given in the high school?" We are of the opinion that, wherever possible, three years of European history, including English history, should be offered in our schools, and that no school should be satisfied to offer less than two years in this field. We do not find that any cogent reasons have been alleged for departing radically from the three-years program laid down by the Committee of Seven and the Committee of Five. In our judgment an ideal program would comprise a year of ancient history, a year of medieval history, including the English, and a year of modern history, including the English. The proportions of the several courses can be varied to suit the demands of different teachers and schools. But in any event this program would provide the amplest opportunity for solid work in European history. It might happen that only the larger schools could maintain three such courses concurrently. But even the smallest schools could carry two of them each year, alternating the second and third as occasion required. Any such arrangement would seem far preferable to the full omission of any year of the three or the merging of any two into one.

2. It has to be recognized, however, that California practice has already gone far toward the elimination of a third year in European history. This elimination has usually taken the form of dropping the separate course in English history. The omission of intensive work in English history entails serious loss; but possibly, if the three-years program must be reduced to two, the sacrifices can best be made at this point. But all the more it becomes incumbent on the teacher to set forth clearly from age to age, the English connections of the larger Continental movements. We urge once more, however, the desirability of the independent course in English history or of giving the English an ample representation in the three-years program.

3. It goes without saying that, in our opinion, a two-years course in European history is the minimum amount which any California high school should provide.³ We do not believe it necessary or expedient to introduce the one-year course at all. A student who cannot take more than one year of European history will gain more than one year of the two-years or three-years course than he can from a more general survey of the whole field. This position, taken by the Committee of Seven in 1899, and reaffirmed by the Committee of Five in 1911, finds abundant confirmation in the experience of the best teachers. The school that offers two years or three years of European history makes the best possible provision for the student whose time is limited as well as for the

others. And it does not put temptation in the way of students who ought to have the longer course, by offering a cheap and plausible substitute. Beyond question the best historical training comes from the intensive study of a limited field, never from a promiscuous scattering over the whole area of human progress. The student who follows the policy advocated here may not gain a bird's-eye view of all history, but he will acquire a solid and dependable foundation, and the bird's-eye view can come later. For these reasons we believe that the one-year student should be given one of the regular courses and that no other provision should be made for his needs. We believe that in making its historical program the school should have in view not only the one-year student, but also the large number who desire a fuller knowledge of the European field. Three years are not too much; two years are little enough; one year is altogether insufficient for the need.

V. *Content of the One-Year Course in European History.*

Believing, as we do, that there is no legitimate and pressing demand for a one-year course, we could be well satisfied to leave the discussion at this point, letting our argument carry whatever weight it may. But our understanding of the task laid upon us does not permit us to deal with the issue in that way. The question, as we interpret it, might be put in this way: "Granting that a separate one-year course must be provided, what should be its character and content? And to this question we feel it imperative to make reply.

1. It is our conviction that, if a one-year course must be offered, it should take the form of a continuous account of European progress and not be made up of disconnected episodes. It is true that the traversing of all European history in one year spreads the treatment very thin. We do not by any means favor such a method of teaching the subject. We are only saying that, bad as it is, a comprehensive course in general history seems to us preferable to a mere series of unrelated events, movements, and what not, selected arbitrarily from the field. Of two evils we are trying to choose the less. The selection of historical materials here and there may conceivably serve various useful purposes, but it cannot give the sense of historical continuity, the insight into historical processes, which are the chief rewards of the student. The concentration of the year's work on a definite period, such as the ancient period or the modern, would be a different story; it would give opportunity for solid, coherent study. But as between the two remaining methods of treatment, we definitely prefer the general course, with all its limitations, to the haphazard, hop-skip-and-jump method which has lately come somewhat into vogue.

2. In the same connection we may call attention to the tendency, already mentioned, to view the whole field of history too narrowly from the standpoint of the present, and to shape the teaching too closely to

³ It is the minimum recommended by the Committee of Twenty-one.

this ideal. Undoubtedly the present is more important to us and to our pupils than any period in the past; undoubtedly it is more significant for their life and ours. It is imperative that his school studies interpret for the student the world in which he lives. But, as we see it, some of the history teaching of today construes this demand in altogether too restricted a way. The pupil lives in the present, but the very purpose of his schooling should be to widen the world in which he lives by bringing him into vital understanding of other peoples, other ages, and other issues of human society. No other branch of learning has the opportunity thus given to history to broaden the life of the individual. The course in history must indeed explain the problems of to-day; but over and above that, it should reveal in the clearest light the great problems which have confronted men in all ages. Some of them are our problems, some are not; but all of them are vast issues of human destiny, and as such they belong to us as truly as if they were our own. The past should be studied not merely for the sake of the present, but also for the sake of the past itself. We believe there is no surer criterion of good teaching than the degree in which it begets this broadly human attitude of mind in those who are taught.

3. Another tendency of the times comes into view here—the tendency to overemphasize recent history. Here the motive is the same, to vitalize the history and give it reality in the mind of the pupil; and in itself this is entirely a commendable impulse. But we think it a mistake to give a disproportionate amount of time to recent history, just because, in the long run, such a policy will devitalize rather than vitalize the history, by cutting it off from its deeper roots in the past. Some teachers would condense all European history before the nineteenth century into one year and devote a second year to the period since Napoleon. But how explain Napoleon and the French Revolution without going back to the Old Regime and Feudalism and the Roman Empire and Alexander, and the beginnings of human despotism? The story is one from beginning to end. If one is to understand the story, it is never wise to skip the earlier chapters and hurry on to the climax where the hero and the heroine are married and live happily ever after. We believe in making much of the modern period in European history, as is indicated in the course of study suggested below. We are only entering our demurrer against the tendency to let the modern period become the whole thing, to the serious detriment of due proportion and sound teaching.

4. Acting under the conviction expressed above, the committee has drawn up and herewith submits a series of topics for such a one-year course as would most nearly accomplish our ideals. While we ourselves think little of such a course, it is the best answer we can give to the definite problem laid before us. We have attempted no more than a list of weekly lesson topics, leaving to the teacher the selection of the more detailed materials for the daily recitations. The out-

line assumes a year of thirty-eight weeks, five recitations a week.

VI. Outline of the One-Year Course in European History.

- A. ANCIENT HISTORY (to A. D. 476). Six weeks.
 1. The Oriental Monarchies.
 2. Greece.
 3. Greece.
 4. Rome.
 5. Rome.
 6. Rome (to A. D. 476).
- B. MEDIEVAL HISTORY (A. D. 476-1492). Twelve weeks.
 7. The Barbarian Invasions.
 8. The Franks, A. D. 471-867.
 9. Feudalism.
 10. The Medieval Church.
 11. The Medieval Empire.
 12. France and England.
 13. France and England.
 14. The Saracen and Byzantine Civilizations.
 15. The Crusades.
 16. Medieval Civilization.
 17. The Renaissance.
 18. Antecedents of the Reformation.
- C. MODERN HISTORY (A. D. 1492-1914). Twenty weeks.
 19. The Reformation.
 20. The Religious Wars (to A. D. 1648).
 21. The Rise of Prussia.
 22. Russia.
 23. England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.
 24. France in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.
 25. England and France in the Eighteenth Centuries.
 26. Antecedents of the French Revolution.
 27. The French Revolution.
 28. Napoleon.
 29. Nationality, Democracy, Liberty.
 30. The Industrial Revolution.
 31. England in the Nineteenth Century.
 32. Italy in the Nineteenth Century.
 33. Germany in the Nineteenth Century.
 34. France in the Nineteenth Century.
 35. The Eastern Question: Austro-Hungary, Turkey and the Balkans.
 36. The Far Eastern Question: Russia and the Far East.
 37. European Expansion in the Nineteenth Century.
 38. Europe in the Twentieth Century.

VII. Summary and Conclusion.

1. The position taken in this report may be summarized as follows:

- a. The time is not opportune for introducing a one-year course.

- b. No imperative demand for a separate one-year course in European history exists in our schools at the present time.
- c. The introduction of such a course would seriously injure good history teaching in the schools.
- d. The needs of the one-year student in European history are sufficiently provided for in the present courses in the subject.
- e. If a one-year course in European history is introduced into our schools, it should be a general survey of European development.
- f. Outline of a one-year course in European history.

2. In conclusion the sub-committee feels constrained to apologize for the voluminous character of its report. At the same time we feel that the seriousness of the issue warrants the most careful deliberation on the problem before us. We have spoken frankly. We have not meant to be controversial. To some the position taken in the report will seem blindly reactionary. In reply we can only say we think we understand the situation, and that if we are reactionary, we are such with our eyes open. We do not believe in any unthinking adherence to tradition. We recognize that as yet none of us knows any too much about the momentous business of teaching history. All of us together are open-minded and eager to learn. If we cannot give our adherence to the present proposal, it is not because we do not want to go forward, but because, with the best wisdom we have, we cannot see any promise of progress in that direction through the line of action here under consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY PILLOT,
MARGARET SMITH,
ALLEN M. KLINE,

Sub-Committee for the Peninsula Section.

W. L. GLASSCOCK,
ARLEY B. SHOW, Chairman.

III. RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE BAY SECTION.

A recommendation to the Commission appointed by the California High School Teachers' Association to investigate and report concerning the history which should be studied by those high school students who may have but one year in the European field.

I. *Aim.*—The aim toward which the arrangement of high school programs should strive is a course in history consisting of consecutive subjects studied in logical order. The present plan, that of offering various subjects to be elected by students at random, yields unsatisfactory results, possibly the worst of which is that students who study American history and civics in a majority of cases have not covered a course in European history affording important background. The effectiveness of history as a part of the American system of education depends upon the gen-

eral study of the history and institutions of our own country for which the preparation has been laid by the study of European history and the development of European civilization. These form the necessary background, which cannot be supplied by students' occasional election of only part of the subjects forming this essential course. History programs in Continental European schools show full recognition of this principle, and all graduates complete the full course. It is as essential in America as in Europe that the standard course in history should preserve substantial uniformity. For this the work of four important committees of national reputation and authority have prepared the way.

II. *American History and Civics a Prerequisite to Graduation.*—The course in American history and civics, constituting the essential terminal subject of such a course of study, should immediately be prescribed by state authority as a prerequisite to graduation from the high school.

III. *The Two-Year Course in European History.*—No one-year course in European history is adequate to cover the ground. The one-year course in general history is to be discouraged as contrary to the best practice and the generally accepted standards of the past twenty years. Two years are necessary for the European field, as implied both in the curriculum advised by the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association and in that proposed more recently by the Committee of Twenty-one of the National Educational Association. In view of present conditions this seems especially imperative in the cases of those students who cannot go on to college. But the study of the first-year course in European history by students unable to continue their work by the study of the intervening period, which forms the immediate background to American history, is to be discouraged. The year course in ancient history is valuable to all those who can take it, but it should be followed in every case by the course in medieval and modern history.

IV. *One-Year Students of European History.*—When students' programs admit of the study of but one year of European history, as sometimes happens with those who are preparing to enter engineering or technical colleges, this year should be devoted to work which prepares the way for the study of American history. The field should be either medieval and modern history or modern European history at the option of the school, and this course should be as prerequisite to the study of American history. Where conditions permit this may advantageously be done in the year prior to that in which American history is taken. Inasmuch as these classes will have no knowledge of first-year European history, a brief introduction is essential to prepare them to pursue their work intelligently. Whenever possible, they should be segregated from classes which have covered the field of the first year's study.

IV. FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION APPOINTED IN 1917 TO RECOMMEND A ONE-YEAR COURSE IN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

One year ago the History Section of the State High School Teachers' Association provided for the appointment of a Commission of ten persons to study the problem of a course in European history for such pupils as can devote but one year to the subject, and to recommend such a course. Mr. William J. Cooper, the presiding officer of the section meetings, was directed to appoint the members of the Commission. He appointed the following: Miss Jane E. Harnett, Long Beach, chairman; Professor William A. Morris, University of California; Mr. E. J. Berringer, Sacramento; Miss Ruth E. McGrew, Sacramento; Mr. John G. Iliff, Stockton; Miss Sara L. Dole, Los Angeles; Miss Anna Stewart, Los Angeles; Professor Arley B. Shaw, Stanford University; Dr. H. A. N. Cleven, San Diego, and Mr. John R. Sutton, Oakland. Professor Alexis F. Lange, and Mr. Will C. Wood, State Commissioner of Secondary Education, were invited to become advisory members.

The first meeting of the Commission was held in Berkeley, July 31, 1917. The chairman appointed Dr. Cleven secretary, and plans for future work were adopted. The state was divided into sections, and each member of the Commission was assigned to a section, with instructions to appoint four others to serve with him or her as a sub-committee.

The chairman and secretary were directed to prepare a questionnaire for the purpose of ascertaining the present status of the work in history in the high schools of the state. The questionnaire as finally formulated propounded five questions: 1. What courses in history, civics, and sociology does your school offer? 2. Which of these courses are required for graduation, and what is your minimum requirement in history? 3. How many students did you graduate in 1917? 4. How many of these took two years' work in European history, how many took one year's work, and of what did this consist? 5. Your suggestions for a one-year course for such pupils as can give only one year to European history.

Copies of this questionnaire were sent to the different members of the Commission, and were by them sent to the high schools of their respective sections. In the course of a few months 148 of these were returned to the secretary of the Commission from all parts of the state. Accompanying many of them were letters containing opinions, discussions, and suggestions. In some sections meetings of history teachers were held to discuss the question of a one-year course, and its relation to other history courses; and the conclusions arrived at in some of these local meetings were forwarded to the secretary. Furthermore, the question has been discussed at institutes and other gatherings of teachers during the year; and many of us remember the able discussion of one phase of the subject by Miss Harnett, chairman of the Commission, here in Berkeley last November. The questionnaire blanks, letters, and reports from the different sections which have accumulated in the hands of the secretary constitute a considerable volume of valuable material bearing on the question.

Under ordinary circumstances the report of such a Commission ought to be a document of considerable value. But the circumstances affecting this body have not been ordinary. You have doubtless all learned of the sad and untimely death of Miss Harnett, our chairman, in mid-winter. For some time the Commission was without a chairman, and when the present chairman was appointed it was expected that the secretary would prepare the final report. But about two weeks ago the secretary, for good and sufficient reasons, resigned from the Commission, and sent the material in his possession to the chairman. About the same time Mr. Iliff departed for France.

Within two weeks' time the chairman has had to analyze the material sent by the secretary, and to obtain the opinions of members through the mail, for a meeting of the Commission has been impossible. The preparation of this report has therefore necessarily been hasty. It simply attempts to summarize the work of the Commission, to state the arguments pro and con relative to the problems which we have had to consider, and finally to present the conclusions concurred in by the majority.

Of the 148 questionnaire blanks that were returned to the secretary, ten had to be discarded because they contained insufficient data to be of any value. This is unfortunate, because some of these were from large schools, the ten having some 700 graduates in 1917.

The remaining 138 blanks reported 5,114 graduates, most of them for the year 1917, but some for 1916. Of these, 2,513, or 45 per cent., had taken two years of European history; and 1,231, or 24 per cent., had taken only one year of European history. This one year's work was distributed as follows: 712, or 66 per cent., took ancient history; 212, or 19 per cent., medieval and modern history; 78, or 7 per cent., general history; and 37, or 3 per cent., English history.¹

The blanks show considerable uniformity in the history courses given in the high schools of the state. They consist in most cases of ancient history, medieval and modern history, and American history and government, with a comparatively small number of schools offering general history, English history, economics, and some form of sociology.

Of the 148 schools reporting (the ten discarded for details previously referred to are included here) 123 require American history and government for graduation, and of these 20 require an additional year of history, and nine require two or (in a few cases) three years. Twelve schools have no requirement at all in history, twelve require one year of any history offered, and one requires two years of any history offered.

Naturally the request in the questionnaire for suggestions as to the content of the proposed one-year course in European history stimulated much discussion, and brought out numerous differences of opinion on the part of the history teachers of the state.

¹ These percentages are based on the number 1053, not 1231, because twelve schools, having 163 graduates, did not report how the one year's work in European history was distributed.

Of the 148 schools which returned the blanks, 29 made no reply to the request for suggestions relative to the content of a one-year course; 33 stated unqualified opposition to a one-year course under any circumstances; 32 proposed for one-year pupils the second half of the usual two-year course, that is, medieval and modern history; 21 favored a course specially stressing the modern period; 16 favored general history, that is, the usual two-year course condensed to a one-year compass; 6 favored a one-year course without suggesting its content; and 11 proposed courses which might be classed as unusual. These latter may be briefly indicated as follows: a course in current events; a course beginning with the present and working backward; a course in English constitutional history; a course devised to explain present conditions in Europe; a course in world history to the year 1492; or a course concerned with certain specific phases of human activity, such as agriculture, commerce, labor, industry, art, manufacturing, home life, etc.

These suggestions relative to a one-year course indicate that the teachers of California are divided in respect to this matter on a number of important points. In the first place, we note that some teachers would not tolerate such a course under any circumstances; some would tolerate it more or less willingly; and some are heartily in favor of it. Our investigation demonstrates that those opposing a one-year course are more numerous than those who favor it, for those proposing that all one-year pupils be given the regular course in medieval and modern history are clearly not in favor of establishing a special one-year course. And of the 21 who proposed a special course in modern history, 9 indicated opposition to a one-year course on principle, making it clear that the course suggested should be used only in case of necessity. Thus the 119 schools which responded to the request for suggestions as to a one-year course would stand as follows on the question of the desirability of such a course.

OPPOSED TO A ONE-YEAR COURSE.

Those expressing definite opposition.....	33
Those suggesting that one-year pupils take the regular course in medieval and modern history.	32
Those suggesting a course in modern history to be given only in case of necessity	9
	74

FAVORING A ONE-YEAR COURSE.

Those expressing definite approval	6
Those proposing a course in general history....	16
Those proposing a special course in modern history	12
Those proposing other special courses	11
	45

Teachers who may be classed as favoring a one-year course in European history would equally prefer that all pupils take two years. They argue, however, that many pupils, especially in vocational and

technical schools, as well as all pupils preparing for engineering courses in the so-called classical schools, find it impossible to take more than one year of European history, and that therefore a special course should be provided for them. Some of them maintain that many details comprehended in the two-year course are of little value, and that the course would gain in interest, while losing little in the nature of valuable material, by being reduced to the compass of one year's work. This gain in interest would result from the fact that the shorter course would deal with only large and vital problems, omitting non-essentials.

Many of the teachers who are opposed to a one-year course are not willing to admit that it is impossible for any group of high school pupils to take two years of European history. They maintain that if history teachers will stand firm for a two-year course they will get it, and that other subjects will adjust themselves accordingly. They argue that engineers, and other technically trained men and women, are just as much American citizens as other people; and that an understanding of European history is an essential item in their preparation for citizenship. They insist that a knowledge of the technique of one's profession or calling is too narrow a basis upon which to build manhood or womanhood; and that school authorities who are operating on this basis are wrong, and the history teacher should endeavor to show them wherein they are wrong. He cannot do this by showing a willingness to establish cheap and superficial courses in history in our high schools, but by doing all in his power to prevent the establishment of such courses.

Other teachers, who are opposed on principle to a one-year course, nevertheless recognize that there will always be many pupils who will not give two years to European history, but who will give one year. The teachers believe that it is not wise to establish any special courses for these one-year pupils, but that they should take either the first or second, preferably the second, half of the regular two-year course. They argue that a one-year course if regularly installed in our high schools would tend to undermine the two-year course in some such way as cheap money drives out good money according to the operation of Gresham's law. If a student can get European history in one year, why give two years to it? Thus to establish a one-year course in the interests of a minority of our pupils would militate against the more important work on behalf of the majority. It is further argued that administrative school officers would be inclined to favor the one-year over the two-year course simply because European history would thus be disposed of with less expense.

It is argued that the reduction of the time devoted to European history to one year would not benefit our work in civics or economics or current history or any other branch of the social science group, for the time saved would be absorbed by other subjects, particularly those of the commercial and vocational departments. The pressure for a shorter course in history, as in other cultural subjects, such as language,

science, mathematics, comes chiefly from these latter interests. To quote from the very able report of the sub-committee of the Peninsula Section: "Any yielding to this demand is likely to result in an absolute reduction of time allowed, not merely for European history, but for all non-vocational subjects. If the history teacher has to yield to this pressure he must of course make the best of it; but it is difficult to find adequate reasons why he should be an active party to his own undoing." Again quoting from the report: "As we see the situation, the shorter course would ultimately lead to a reduction of the amount of time given to historical studies in the schools. We have already expressed the conviction that this movement had its origin in the endeavor to restrict the cultural subjects in the school curriculum; and in the degree in which the movement succeeds we believe it will accomplish its purpose. Even if the time taken away from European history could be saved for other historical studies we should doubt the wisdom of the innovation. Much more is it to be deplored, if the time thus released is lost entirely to historical studies and is devoted to quite other ends."

"We are aware that many useful and desirable subjects are seeking entrance into the high school. Every open-minded teacher of history must give them welcome and wish them well. But this is no time for the teacher of history to deny his birthright or to sacrifice in the least degree his sacred responsibility in the training of youth for citizenship and for the service of society. If the course in European history is not essential to these great ends it ought to be dropped entirely; if it is essential, it ought to be kept at full strength and made more and more effective for the work in hand."

"We believe also that the shorter course in European history would inevitably lead to a poorer quality of teaching and a poorer quality of learning. The half can never be equal to the whole. No subject can be taught in one year as well as in two, or in two years as well as in three. These principles are axiomatic. And yet we find teachers ready to maintain that they can 'cover' European history in one year and do as good work as they formerly did in two or three. It may be granted that, in certain respects, if the teaching is competent, the abbreviated course may yield excellent results. But it certainly cannot yield the comprehensive and coherent knowledge of European history which is the only legitimate ideal of historical instruction in the schools. By a 'comprehensive' knowledge we mean a reasonable grasp of the big essentials of European history as a whole; by a 'coherent' knowledge we mean a reasonable insight into the causal connection of events and movements as the centuries pass along. Without these results historical study has little justification; with them it becomes fruitful in the highest degree. And because the one-year course must inevitably sacrifice these ends, we feel constrained to take sides against it."

The report asserts that any one-year course cannot help being, in its essential nature, a course in general

history, which experience has weighed in the balance and found wanting. To quote further:

"It goes without saying that, in our opinion, a two-year course in European history is the minimum amount which any California high school should provide. We do not believe it necessary or expedient to introduce the one-year course at all. A student who cannot take more than one year of European history will gain more from one year of the two-years or three-years course than he can from a more general survey of the whole field. This position, taken by the Committee of Seven in 1899, and reaffirmed by the Committee of Five in 1911, finds abundant confirmation in the experience of the best teachers. The school that offers two years or three years of European history makes the best possible provision for the student whose time is limited as well as for the others. And it does not put temptation in the way of students who ought to have the longer course by offering a cheap and plausible substitute."

"Beyond question the best historical training comes from the intensive study of a limited field, never from the promiscuous scattering over the whole area of human progress. The student who follows the policy advocated here may not gain a bird's-eye view of all history, but he will acquire a solid and dependable foundation, and the bird's-eye view can come later."

These quotations make clear the position of the teachers of history in the Peninsula Section south of San Francisco, on the question of the establishment of a one-year course in European history. The teachers of the Bay Section at a meeting held in Berkeley, April 25, came to practically the same conclusions relative to the proposed one-year course. They adopted a recommendation, addressed to the History Commission, to the effect that a minimum two-year course in European history should be offered by every high school; and that those students who can devote but one year to the subject should take either medieval and modern history or modern history at the option of the school. This course in modern history, when given, should be preceded by a brief introduction, pointing out the main features of earlier history, in order to give it its proper setting. Pupils who have had the course in early European history should be, when practicable, segregated from those taking only the one year's work. This recommendation further states that one year's work in American history and government should be required of students graduating from high schools. This item was included because the teachers present felt that a complete course in history should be recommended to all high schools, and that the work in history throughout the state should be so far as practicable standardized. Students taking but one year of European history would simply take the second year's work of the standard two-year course, and no special one-year course would be provided for them.

From the foregoing it will be apparent that there has been much argument among the history teachers

of the state respecting the advisability of establishing a one-year course in European history.

Another question concerning which there is wide difference of opinion relates to the subject matter to be covered by students who take but one year of European history. This question has, of course, been already answered in so far as those teachers are concerned who are not in favor of a separate one-year course, but would have all one-year students take the second half of the two-year course.

Returning to our statistics we see that 16 schools proposed "general history" for the one-year course, 21 proposed a special course in modern history, and 11 proposed courses featuring special phases of human activity. There has not been much discussion respecting the "general history" proposition, nor respecting the proposed course in modern history, for the advocates of these courses have little difficulty in reaching a compromise with the advocates of the proposition that one-year students should take medieval and modern history. All these courses are based on the principle that work in history should follow the chronological sequence of events, and the advocates of "general history" are usually ready to agree to treat ancient history as an introduction to medieval and modern history, while the advocates of modern history are usually ready to incorporate a generous allowance of medieval history as an introduction to modern history.

But when it comes to the proposition of discarding chronology, and making up a course in history from certain selected phases of human development, there is decided disagreement.

Those who favor such a procedure believe that the "block" system, as they call the present system, does not allow a presentation of the work in a way that appeals to boys and girls of high school age. They argue that "a chronological sequence may do very well for a diagrammatic study of history; but it is not possible, apparently, to present those events which appeal to the interest of young people by this method." They assert that it is not only more interesting to the pupils to select some line of development and follow it from ancient times to the present day, but that it is more vital to them. They are convinced that students in vocational and technical schools need a different kind of history from that which is taught to students of other schools. The history of commerce, or of manufacture, or of transportation, or of some other field of industry would naturally appeal to such students, and what would appeal to and interest them is what they ought to have. But the advocates of this kind of history would not restrict it to vocational and technical schools; they would establish it in all high schools.

But they are meeting serious opposition. One teacher writes: "History should not be divided into vertical blocks, dealing each with some one phase of man's activity. If the European war has taught us anything, it has taught us that our vision must not be limited by our vocations. The boy is not adequately prepared for life by studying the history

of transportation because he is to paint wagons for a living—nor a girl by studying the history of homes, and dressing dolls in Greek costumes."

"Interest and utility should underlie all high school history teaching. The interest element depends upon the universality of human experience. Its utility is social rather than vocational. History may supplement vocation, but should not be subordinate to it. Vocations are to enrich the pocketbook; history is to enrich life." And to quote again from the report of the sub-committee representing the Peninsula Section:

"When the one-year course gives up the attempt to present a comprehensive and coherent review of European development, and arbitrarily selects episodes for exploitation here and there, it ceases to be even general history, and becomes merely a historical scrap-bag for the use of other branches of learning. Historical facts and episodes are constantly employed in the teaching of language, literature, art, science, and the like; but such employment, even on the largest scale, does not constitute the study of history. Even where history is used to illustrate and confirm the teaching of its affiliated social sciences, such as politics, economics, sociology, the same thing is true; it is not history in the proper sense of the term. In the opinion of the present committee, this is the point at which the movement for a one-year course in European history shows its true nature and its radical weakness. It seeks to subordinate history to other branches of school instruction; at any rate, it tends to bring about such subordination.

It must not be thought that any of the arguments here presented against a one-year course, or against a course made up of some special phase of human activity, are inspired by a desire to protect and defend the subject of history itself against innovations. History is always being reinterpreted and rewritten, and as it is presented to us it is always in a process of change. It needs no defense. Experiments in the teaching of it which are not founded on right principles will in the due course of time pass away. The opponents of the proposed changes have a deep conviction that an understanding of European history is tremendously needed in the United States to-day; that the more thoroughly it can be taught to our young people, the more value it will be to them and to our country; and that no one slender thread of it detached from its proper setting, no matter how interesting within itself it may be, can assist very much in giving that well balanced comprehension of the past which will make for good, intelligent citizenship in our own day. No, this is not a defense of history; it is a defense of what a majority of your Commission considers the best interests of our high school boys and girls, and of the nation which now so sorely needs the highest measure of intelligence which our schools can give to its citizens.

Since the death of Miss Harnett, the resignation of Dr. Cleven, and the departure of Mr. Iliff for France, the Commission now consists of seven members. Four of the seven are opposed to the establishment of

any specific one-year course in European history in our high schools, two are definitely in favor of such a course, and the opinion of the remaining member has not been ascertained.

A majority of your Commission, therefore, recommends that no one-year course in European history be sanctioned by the History Section of the High School Teachers' Association of California, and that high school students who can give but one year's time to European history should take the second half of the

two-year course. The majority also recommends that the minority members of the Commission be invited to file a minority report, if they so desire.

This report was concurred in by the following members of the Commission:

PROF. ARLEY B. SHOW,
PROF. WILLIAM A. MORRIS,
MISS ANNA STEWART,
JOHN R. SUTTON, Chairman.

Geography and Reconstruction

Never before has there been such a need for a clear understanding of geography in its relation to races and nations.

Classes in history and in geography need frequent practice with Outline Maps in order to become familiar with the locations of regions and races which have recently grown significant.

THE McKINLEY OUTLINE MAPS

in Wall and Desk sizes are excellently adapted for such uses. There is not a disputed area of the earth which is not depicted upon some of the maps of this series.

Write for free samples, stating the phase of history or geography in which you are interested, to

McKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

Historical Outlook Reprints

These pamphlets are of great value to teachers, students and general readers who wish to become familiar with the antecedents of the Great War, its progress, and also the foundations for reconstruction.

ALREADY ISSUED:

- No. 1. **The Study of the Great War.** By PROF. S. B. HARDING. Price, 20 cents each.
- No. 2. **War Curiosities and the Belgium Secret Press.** By PROF. CHRISTIAN GAUSS. Price, 10 cents each.
- No. 3. **A Bibliography of the Great War.** By PROF. GEORGE M. DUTCHER. Price, 25 cents each.
- No. 4. **War Geography, with Many Maps.** By PROF. S. B. HARDING and PROF. W. E. LINGELBACH. Price, 20 cents each.
- No. 5. **Syllabus of a Course of Study in the Preliminaries of the World Conflict.** By HALFORD L. HOSKINS. Price, 20 cents each.
- No. 6. **A Selection from the Addresses of President Wilson.** Price, 20 cents each.
- No. 7. **Important Statutes and Executive Proclamations Issued in the United States from April, 1917, to May, 1918.** Price, 25 cents each.
- No. 8. **Economic Materials Bearing upon the World War.** Arranged by PROF. W. E. LINGELBACH. Price, 20 cents each.
- No. 9. **Economic Mobilization of the United States for the War of 1917.** Price, 20 cents each.

Liberal discounts when ordered in quantities.

Nearly all the above reprints and much additional matter, bringing the documents down to November 11, 1918, will be found in

Collected Materials for the Study of the War

Revised Edition.

By ALBERT E. MCKINLEY

PRICE, 80 CENTS NET. Bound in boards, 220 pages, equivalent to an ordinary book of over 600 pages

MCKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

1619 Ranstead Street

Philadelphia

DO YOU KNOW

William Morris Davis
 Charles R. Dryer
 J. Russell Smith
 Jacques W. Redway
 Ellsworth Huntington
 Sumner W. Cushing
 Frank Carney
 George B. Roorbach

Albert Bushnell Hart
 James H. Breasted
 Samuel B. Harding
 Herbert E. Bolton
 Carl F. Huth, Jr.
 David M. Matteson

The men in the first group above are editing a new series of geography maps which will be the finest school maps "Made in America." These maps will be ready shortly after the new boundaries are determined. The following maps (size 44 x 54 inches) will be included in this new series:

United States
 Europe
 Asia
 Africa

North America
 South America
 Eastern Hemisphere

Western Hemisphere
 World
 Eastern United States

The men in the second group have edited comprehensive series of Ancient, European, and American History Maps, which are now being used with excellent results throughout the United States, not only in history courses but also in classes in geography.

For further particulars fill in the coupon and mail

DENOYER-GEPPERT COMPANY,

(H-O-5-19)

460 East Ohio Street, Chicago

I am interested in the following maps:

☐ New Geography Maps

☐ Harding European History Maps

☐ Hart American History Maps

☐ Breasted Ancient History Maps

Name _____

Position _____

Town _____

State _____